

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1962

Roman Catholic elementary education and the movement for educational reform in England, 1869–1872.

Gerald Wayne Olsen
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Olsen, Gerald Wayne, "Roman Catholic elementary education and the movement for educational reform in England, 1869–1872." (1962). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6313.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6313>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

**ROMAN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
AND THE MOVEMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL
REFORM IN ENGLAND, 1869-1872**

**Submitted to the Department of History
of Assumption University of Windsor
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts**

by

Gerald Wayne Olsen, B.A.

**Faculty of Graduate Studies
1962**

UMI Number: EC52492

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC52492

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Approved by:

JPM Whhill (SB)

Mr. Vukowic

J. J. Allen c.s.B.

A B S T R A C T

By 1869, the deficiencies in English elementary education necessitated reform. There were two main opinions on how far this reform should go. The Dissenter-supported National Education League sought to replace the existing sectarian school-system with a new one under secular control. The Anglican-dominated National Education Union wanted the existing system retained and supplemented. These questions are examined in chapter one.

The desire of the Roman Catholics to have the old denominational system of education preserved, because it let them teach Catholic dogma in their own schools, and their efforts to press this position on the authorities, constitute the subject matter of chapter two.

The government met the conflicting demands of the Union and of the League with compromise. Its Education Bill incorporated some proposals of both rival pressure groups. Neither side was completely pleased with the Bill, but it was more acceptable to the Union than to the League. The League members campaigned in the House of Commons to have the Bill amended in their favour. In this, they were fairly successful. These considerations are discussed in chapter three.

The Education Act presented the Roman Catholics with a challenge which they answered remarkably well. They built new schools and re-organized their education society. Also, despite opposition by some of their co-religionists and the hostility of the League, they debated with some success on the new school boards. Attention is given to these subjects in chapter four.

Roman Catholic attempts to influence the education legislation were hampered because the bishops failed to initiate a comprehensive national education society. Furthermore, most of the amendments which were written into the final Education Act were displeasing to the Catholics. But the problems which the Catholics had to solve after the passage of the Act made them assume a degree of social responsibility greater than ever before. These conclusions are made in the last chapter.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

It is a pleasure to thank those people who contributed in different ways to the completion of this thesis.

I owe a particular debt of gratitude to the members of my Advisory Committee who guided me through this academic apprenticeship. Rev. D. J. Mulvihill, C.S.B., Ph.D., Professor and Head of the History Department, first awakened in me a serious historical attitude. At an early stage in my undergraduate studies, he helped me to recognize the vital connection between the idea and the historical event. I am indeed indebted to my friend and counselor, Mr. M. N. Vuckovic, M.A., Lecturer in the History Department, without whose patient suggestions and untiring search for excellence, this work might not have reached the required standards. I am also grateful to Rev. H. V. Mallon, C.S.B., M.A., Professor in the English Department, for examining this thesis from a literary point of view.

The librarian is an indispensable assistant to the researcher. I am thankful to the library staffs of St. John's Provincial Seminary, Plymouth, Michigan; Holy Redeemer College, Windsor and St. Michael's College, Toronto, who showed me extraordinary consideration, by allowing me to temporarily remove valuable materials from their holdings.

I am also obliged to the staff at the Assumption University of Windsor Library, especially to the Reference Librarian, Mr. A. V. Mate, M.A., A.M.L.S., and to many anonymous librarians at the Detroit Public Library, the Detroit Bar Association Library and the Utley Branch Library in Detroit, Michigan, at St. Basil's Seminary Library in Toronto, and at the Catholic University of America Library in Washington, D.C.

I shall always be grateful to Mrs. W. N. VanNest for giving me the benefit of her typing skill. She carefully transcribed almost countless pages of drafts before this thesis reached its final form.

I also express appreciation to some other friends who made this endeavour easier for me. Mr. Leroy Laframboise, B.Sc., and Miss Diana Mady B.A., gave me valuable advice from the reader's point of view. Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Sloan and their son, Michael, and Mr. and Mrs. Henry Woltman and their son, Richard, provided me with hospitality while I was doing research in Detroit.

My parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald E. Olsen, deserve special acknowledgement. Their self-sacrifice and sympathetic understanding encouraged me greatly.

Any errors or omissions in content or style remain entirely within my responsibility.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	111
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. THE CATHOLICS' DESIRE AND EARLY EFFORTS TO HAVE THE OLD SYSTEM OF EDUCATION RETAINED	18
III. THE EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND THE PRESSURE GROUPS	52
IV. ROMAN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROBLEMS IN THE TWO YEARS AFTER THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870	89
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	123
APPENDIX	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152
VITA AUCTORIS.	158

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I

There was no comprehensive system of elementary education in England before the Education Act of 1870. Up to that time, the elementary education of the English children was the voluntary responsibility of the various religious denominations.¹ All English elementary schools were run by societies which the churches had set up for that purpose: the National Society managed Anglican schools; Wesleyan schools were conducted by the Wesleyan Education Committee; the British and Foreign School Society provided schools for the children of Dissenters and the Catholic Poor School Committee² supervised schools for Roman Catholic children.

Although the ultimate responsibility for elementary education was with these sectarian education societies, the State played some part. Since 1833, the Privy Council had made annual grants, at first to build schools and eventually

¹ M. E. Sadler and J. W. Edwards, "Public Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1870-1895", in their Education Department Special Reports on Educational Subjects (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1897), Vol. 1, p. 33.

² John William Adamson, English Education 1789-1902 (Cambridge: University Press, 1930), p. 127.

for their maintenance.³ But because the government grants did not completely pay school building and operating costs, the balance had to be made up with fees paid by the parents and by the voluntary contributions donated by the sectarian organizations.

In addition to providing financial aid, the government supervised the efficiency of elementary education. The State wanted to make sure that the money it gave for education would be used to provide sound education. To secure this desire, in 1862, the system known as "payment by result" had been introduced. Under this plan, inspectors from the Privy Council's Education Committee were sent to schools which requested government grants. These inspectors gave examinations in reading, writing and arithmetic and checked the attendance figures. The government grants were then awarded in proportion to the standards of attendance and efficiency which these schools had attained.⁴

³ In 1833 a grant of 20,000 pounds sterling was given to be shared by the National and the British and Foreign School Societies. ibid., p. 34; The Wesleyan Education Committee began to share in the grants in 1840. ibid., p. 127.

In 1847 the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee was formed and received government aid. H.O. Evennett, The Catholic Schools of England and Wales (Cambridge: University Press, 1944), p. 18.

⁴ See E. L. Woodward, "Education, 1815-1870", in his The Age of Reform 1815-1870 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 462-463.

Religious instruction was one subject which was free from government inspection. The sectarian school managers were given complete freedom, in their respective schools, to teach religion as they chose. After 1847, agreements between the government and the denominational authorities had further guaranteed this freedom: the latter could claim the right to veto the appointment of government inspectors. The result of these agreements was that an inspector was usually of the same faith as the majority in the school which he examined.⁵ English elementary education in 1869 was marked by complete religious freedom.

The system of elementary education which obtained in England before 1870 was a good example of the British genius. The government had not laid down an a priori blueprint for national education. Until that time, it had satisfied itself with aiding and making more efficient, institutions which had sprung up under the aegis of the religious denominations.

The consequences of this arrangement were both beneficial and detrimental. On the credit side, the system emphasized the pluralistic nature of nineteenth century English society. No longer could an English legislature

⁵ Based on H. C. Barnard, A Short History of Education, 1760-1944 (London: University of London Press, 1947), p. 123.

order that all schools teach a national religion. Instead, the Privy Council concerned itself only with the secular results of the denominational schools. Hence, in abstract, the government aimed at diversity in religion and efficiency in secular education.

But there was a serious debit side to this arrangement. The State entered the classroom only as an investor who wanted to see that his money was well-spent. There was no co-ordinated attention to national problems of elementary education. Probably the only connection between the various systems of elementary education - Anglican, Dissenter or Roman Catholic - was their mutual obligation to maintain certain standards of efficiency in order to gain government grants.

The most telling consequence of the lack of co-ordination in this pre-1870 system was its failure to provide elementary schooling for an adequate number of English children. The precise number of children in England and Wales who should have been in school, but were not, was difficult to determine. The contemporary estimates of deficiency varied from 300,000 to 1,500,000. The former figure was set by Lord Robert Montagu, the last Conservative vice-president of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, under the old system. The latter estimate was

⁶
17, February, 1870, House of Commons Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, Vol. 199, cols. 460-471. passim. Hereafter referred to as Hansard. All are 3d series.

given by W. E. Forster, Montagu's Liberal successor who helped to replace the old system.⁷ Forster's figure should be regarded as more valid than Montagu's. When Montagu calculated the deficiency in elementary education, he considered the students in schools which did not receive government aid as being efficiently educated. The reason that these schools did not receive State grants was mainly because they were inefficient and not well enough attended. Forster's statistics did not consider these students as obtaining an adequate education. Therefore, the latter's estimate of a deficiency of 1,500,000 is probably the more accurate.⁸ This shocking number of children who did not go to any school made up at least half of the English population between six and twelve years of age.⁹

⁷ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 441.

⁸ There are indications that even Forster's estimate of a deficiency of 1,500,000 might have been overly conservative. Sir Henry Craik, basing his figures on Reports of the Education Department, claimed that in 1869 1,300,000 children were being educated in state-aided schools, "1,000,000 in schools that received no grant, were not inspected, and were altogether inefficient" and 2,00,000 should have been at school but did not go at all. In other words about 1/3 received a fairly efficient education; 1/2 went to some kind of school; and the other half were without schooling. Craik's estimate of the deficiency is about ten times that of Montagu's. Sir Henry Craik: The State In Its Relation to Education (London: Macmillan, 1884), p. 85.

⁹ Forster, 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 441.

The system of elementary education in England before 1870 had partially answered potential religious difficulties by giving each denomination aid in setting up its own schools. But the disunity which this system implied had produced a somewhat fragmented system which did not adequately provide for the elementary schooling of the English people.

Clearly, something had to be done to relieve, if not to eliminate this deficiency: legislation would have to be passed which would look at English elementary education as a whole and determine how the gaps would be filled within a more comprehensive framework.

II

George Dixon, a member of the House of Commons for Birmingham, started a radical movement to effect this legislation. In early February, 1869, Dixon gathered together a group of prominent Englishmen who were interested in the question of elementary education.¹⁰ This meeting was the beginning of the National Education League, whose proposals were to play a prominent part in influencing the education legislation of the following year.

¹⁰ George Dixon, 14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1923.

The aim of the League, as outlined in its circular, was an ambitious one: "The establishment of a system which shall secure the education of every child in England and Wales". To bring this about, the League outlined a radical programme which envisioned an elementary education system of definite organization and financial structure, with compulsory attendance and non-denominational religious¹¹ instruction.

The educational system which the League proposed was not, like the existing one, based on several distinct denominational systems of education. Instead of distributing authority among sectarian education officials, the new plan proposed to outline responsibility on a geographic basis. The onus of maintaining an adequate education system was to be divided between education authorities in the central government and new education officers in the local areas.

First, the local authorities were to make sure that the area which they supervised had a sufficient number of class-rooms. When adequate accommodation had been achieved,

11

The following discussion of the League platform will be based, except where indicated, on the Report of the First General Meeting of the National Education League, in Appendix (A).

they were to be responsible for the management of the schools under their jurisdiction. The central government's part in the organization, which the League advocated, was to act as overseer and inspector. The State's first task would be to enact laws which would empower and compel the local authorities to furnish a sufficient number of school-rooms. Once adequate accommodation had been provided, the central government would send inspectors to the various local school areas in order to ensure that efficient standards of teaching were being observed.

The division of responsibility between central and local authorities was to be extended to the financing of schools. Schools were to be built and maintained by co-operation between officials of the central government and of the local school areas: the central government was to provide education grants and the local authorities were to be given power to levy rates on the citizens under their jurisdiction. This combination of public support, as the League saw it, must completely furnish the costs of elementary education. An important part of the League programme was that elementary school fees were to be abolished and free schooling was to be available for all.

To provide schools - even free schools - was not enough. Some way had to be found to force the great body of illiterate children into the schools which would be erected. So the League argued that the State or local authorities

should be given the direct power to bring about compulsory education.

The most sensitive problem which the League members had to meet was what kind of religious instruction would be given in future elementary schools. The League's answer to England's elementary education problems had been to secularize school administration and effect an united system of schools. The obvious answer to the religious question would have been to make the education system entirely secular and not allow any religious teaching in the schools. In fact, some League members argued that the League should endorse secular education.¹²

But the more prominent League members did not advocate what most nineteenth-century Englishmen called 'godless' education. Whether out of political strategy or from personal conviction the leaders of the League maintained that some religious training should be left in the schools.¹³

¹²

George Dawson, a League member said that he meant education to be "purely secular. Disguise it as you may, to that complexion you must come at last". Cited in Adamson, op. cit., p. 350.

¹³

From one point of view, this can be regarded as a shrewd political manoeuvre. The people of England were not ready to prohibit religious teaching from the classroom and would have condemned any programme which proposed to do this. It was reported that, during the debate on the education question in the House of Commons in 1870, the

An important problem arose when the League tried to combine a consolidated school-system with some kind of classroom teaching of religion. Was it possible to teach the same religious lessons to children of varying religious beliefs without violating their consciences?

George Dixon, the chief of the League, answered this question in the affirmative: he maintained that it was possible to teach religion without offending the religious sensitivities of the children of any denomination. He argued that there were certain Christian teachings common to all sects which could rightfully be taught in the classrooms. The national system of education which he proposed could teach, for example, such commonly-held truths as a future state of existence and the existence of God.¹⁴ Such teaching was characterized by the League as "unsectarian". It would depend heavily on the bare reading of the Bible without sectarian comment.

number of people who petitioned Parliament "for religious education, in some form, was no less than 381,214 as against 23,642 petitioning on the other side". "The New School Boards", Quarterly Review, CXXXI (July, 1871), p. 281. From another point of view, the official League desire to keep some kind of religious instruction in their classrooms represented sincere affection on the part of some League members for religious training. During the debate over Forster's Education Bill, Vernon Harcourt, a League member, staunchly denied that the League stood for secular education and he added that if it ever did, he would promptly resign from the League. 14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1924.

¹⁴

14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1924.

The League's espousal of unsectarian religious instruction implicitly opposed the existing denominational method of religious teaching. Dixon said that in the new system: "there should be taught no creed, catechisms, or tenets that were peculiar to any sect".¹⁵ Dixon argued that this kind of religious teaching would not only affect a comprehensive system of national education, but would have the further religious benefit of greater Christian harmony.¹⁶

The League leader even offered a solution to the possible objections by certain sects to the undenominational religious lessons. He singled out the Roman Catholics for special consideration. Since the most prominent class-book to be used in the unsectarian religious exercises would be the Bible, the Catholics, he thought, might object to the use of the Protestant Bible. Dixon suggested that in deference to Catholics and other objectors, a legally enacted Conscience Clause be adopted by which religious teaching would be given before and after the regular secular lessons.

¹⁵
 14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1923.
 Dixon said that he was referring to the League manifesto of February, 1869.

¹⁶
 14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1924.

This would allow these objectors to withdraw from the class-room at the time of religious instruction.¹⁷

In order to better understand the League members' support of creed-less religious instruction, it was important to realize that most of them were "moderate" Dissenters.¹⁸ To the Dissenters, the Bible was the basis of Christianity. Therefore, it was no compromise to emphasize Bible-reading in the class-room; to them it was an admirable thing. Nor was the softening of formulated dogma something which the Dissenters would abhor. Protestantism stressed the individual approach to religious truth and looked with disfavour on church-made fine dogmatic distinctions.¹⁹

But the moderate Dissenters' support of the League-proposed unsectarian system of elementary education was not

¹⁷ 14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1923.

¹⁸ Only the "moderate Dissenters" agreed with the League that unsectarian religious teaching should be allowed in the schools. The "radical Dissenters" argued for purely secular education. See below, Chapter III, pp. 79-80.

¹⁹ In fact, the "denominational" schools which the Dissenters' British and Foreign School Society had set up under the old system were much like the unsectarian ideal which Dixon now advocated. They, too, were co-operative efforts between various sects (although all Dissenting sects); they too minimized dogmatic differences and emphasized Bible-reading. Lord R. Montagu, 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 468.

entirely based on religious beliefs. From a wider point of view, the Dissenters hoped to emerge from the education conflict with a greater status vis à vis the Anglican Church. Under the existing system, the Church of England controlled²⁰ the greatest share of elementary schools. Dissenters claimed that they were treated unfairly under the present system. They hoped that the establishment of a creed-less national system of education would lessen Anglican control²¹ over elementary schools.

III

Although the League's religious settlement was acceptable to most Dissenters, it naively over-looked the wishes of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church; the Anglicans and more especially the Catholics

20

In 1869, the Anglicans received 387,134 pounds sterling from the government for elementary education, while the Nonconformists received only 66,177 pounds. "Elementary School Incomes", Tablet, XXXIV (17, July, 1869), p. 221.

21

The Anglican influence over the elementary education system was especially marked in the rural areas. In those districts the Anglican Church had a virtual monopoly in elementary education. Since the Dissenters' children, at times, had to go to these schools for lack of other schools, they wanted unsectarian schools to be established which would be free of Anglican control and influence. Vernon Harcourt, 18, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 200, col. 216.

would not have supported an educational plan which would exclude the teaching of dogmatic truths. Their more orthodox Christian beliefs stressed formulated dogma.

It was only natural that there should be organized opposition to the League. The main source of this opposition was from a group known as the National Education Union. The formation of this association was begun in the summer of 1869, when prominent supporters of the existing denominational system of elementary education were asked to unite in a common cause. Most of those who responded to the appeal to save the existing system were Anglicans, but there were also members of other faiths, including some prominent Roman Catholics. In September, 1869, the Union issued its memorandum which outlined a counter-programme for national elementary education. Finally, on the third and fourth of November, 1869, under the presidency of Lord Harrowby, the Union held its first general meeting.²²

Like the League, the Union's avowed purpose was to secure the primary education of every child.²³ But the

22

This information is based on a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop, in "The Education Bill - The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

23

The following discussion of the Union platform will be based mainly on "Educational Memorandum-The National Education Union", in Appendix (B).

resemblance between the rival education societies ended there. While the League wanted to accomplish this aim by replacing the existing educational system with a new one, the Union pledged itself to the maintenance and supplementation of the existing system. The Union met the League's radical proposals with conservative counterparts.

The Union disagreed with the League on every count - organization, financing, method of compulsion and nature of religious instruction. The Union rejected the League proposal to give the responsibility of building and maintaining elementary schools to local authorities. It proposed that the existing system, under which the denominational authorities co-operated with the central government to provide and supervise elementary education, be maintained.

Similarly, the Union did not agree to the League's financial proposals. The League had asked that a new system be established which would be supported by the old method of government grants and by a new method of local rates. This, the League said, would make it unnecessary for parents to pay fees for their children's attendance at school. The Union memorandum challenged the principle of financing schools by local rates. It maintained that local rates should be applied to school costs only in the case of a student's extreme poverty. The Union, likewise, rejected the League's proposal to have free schools. It based this

rejection on the principle of parental responsibility for education. The Union memorandum said that parents should have the right to choose what school their children would attend and the duty to pay wholly or partially the cost of education.

The League memorandum had supported the principle of direct compulsion under which children of school-age could be compelled, by local or State authority, to attend school. The Union refused this principle and offered in its place a suggestion that indirect compulsion be adopted. The Union said that laws should be established which would not allow a person to seek employment unless he had undergone the required schooling.

There were many objections raised to the League plan by the Union, but the main reason for the National Education Union's existence was to save the denominational system of education. All other issues were subordinate to the Union's desire to maintain denominational teaching in the schools.

Throughout the education contest, before, during and after legislation, no contention between the Union and the League was fought with more attention, fervour or determination than the religious issue. The conservative defenders of the old system of education wanted the denominational school managers to continue the administration of elementary education. The liberal attackers of that system

wanted the sectarian school managers to hand over the administration of elementary schools to public secular authorities. The defenders wanted to have full doctrinal classroom teaching of religion remain unrestricted. The attackers wanted to eliminate sectarian religious teaching. The elementary education battle was carried out under religious banners. One of these banners bore the standard of the Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER II

THE CATHOLICS' DESIRE AND EARLY EFFORTS TO HAVE THE OLD SYSTEM OF EDUCATION RETAINED

I

The Roman Catholics' position in the education contest was based on what they considered timeless principle. From their point of view, definite religious training was an essential part of the education of youth. According to the Catholics there could be no true education without this distinct doctrinal teaching.¹

Archbishop Manning, the metropolitan of the English Catholic Church, applied this general principle to the particular situation which existed in England in 1869. In a pastoral on education, the Archbishop said that the ideal educational situation would be possible if all the members of

¹ During the education contest, the Catholic organs often quoted a letter which Pope Pius IX had written, in 1864, to the Archbishop of Freiburg, regarding the church's place in education: "... The education which undertakes to form the tender minds and hearts, malleable as wax in their inclination to vice, of children, without the aid of Christian doctrine ... can only bring down upon private families and upon the State the greatest misfortune". "The Pope on Popular Education", Tablet, XXXIV (28, August, 1869), p. 400.

a country adhered to the same religion. Then one set of religious beliefs could be taught to students in all schools. But he realized that this was no longer feasible. The people of England were divided into many religious sects and it would be unfair to impose one religious creed on all.

Hence because of its religious disunity, England had to settle for the "next best" plan - the one which existed when Manning issued his 1869 Pastoral. Under the existing plan, the various religious denominations with some financial aid from the State set up their own schools. The voluntary exertions by the sects made it possible for them to have their own schools to teach freely and fully² their own doctrine and beliefs.

The Catholics believed that this existing system of education was the only one morally possible in modern England. Since definite religious training was essential to true education and since the people of England did not agree what form this training should take, the current division of educational responsibility along denominational lines had to be maintained. According to Catholic opinion, in the pluralistic society of modern England, this was the only acceptable plan of action. English elementary education

² Henry Edward Manning, "Archbishop of Westminster's Pastoral" (delivered 6, June, 1869), Tablet, XXXIV (12, June, 1869), pp. 61-62. Hereafter referred to as "Pastoral, 1869".

had to remain divided. Nothing was to stand in the way of full religious teaching.³

The Catholics were satisfied with the existing system because it left them free to teach their own religious catechisms in their own schools.⁴ But that did not mean that they had no objections to that system. Their main complaint was that the State did not give enough money for the building and maintenance of Catholic schools. The English Catholics were a financially poor body⁵ and they needed money from the State to carry on the elementary education of their children. They hoped that any new

³ Bishop W. B. Ullathorne of Birmingham said, in a meeting at Birmingham, that the denominational system of education, as it existed in 1869, was "best adapted to the peculiar circumstances of this country". in "Meeting at Birmingham", Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 801.

⁴ T. W. Allies, who was secretary of the Catholic Poor School Committee from 1853 to 1890, said, in the "Catholic Poor School Committee Report, 1869", that on the whole, the Committee of the Privy Council on Education had treated the Catholics "with equity". Cited in "The Primary Education of the Poor", Month, XI (September, 1869), p. 226.

⁵ There were, in 1869, about 1,242,000 Catholics in England. T. W. Allies, "The Bearing of the New Education Act on the Catholic Population", Month, XIII (November, 1870), p. 609. Of these about half were poor immigrants from Ireland. Denis Gwynn, "The Irish Immigration", in The English Catholics, 1850-1950, G. A. Beck ed. (London: Burns Oates, 1950), pp. 279-280. The Catholic

legislation would make more State aid available for their schools.⁶ The Catholics wanted the old system retained but they also requested more government money.

The Catholic position in the education contest was centred around these two desires. The Catholics wanted unqualified assurance that future elementary schools could teach sectarian doctrine without restriction. And they wanted guarantees of increased financial aid from the state. The latter wish was definitely subordinate to the former. State financial aid was to the Catholics merely an instrument by which denominational education could be advanced.⁷ Their main concern was to secure the freedom of religious teaching so that Catholic children could learn the Catholic faith in Catholic schools.

middle class was small. "Catholic Interests and the Late Session of Parliament", Month, XIII (October, 1870), p. 386.

⁶ Archbishop Manning said that if the State doubled its grants, voluntary efforts would increase too. "Pastoral, 1869", p. 62. T. W. Allies, speaking at a meeting of the National Education Union, said that government financial support was inadequate. At the same meeting, Lord Howard of Glossop, Catholic Poor School Committee President, called the government support miserable. "National Education Union - Congress in Manchester", Tablet, XXXIV (6, November, 1869), p. 735.

⁷ The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle implied in a pastoral that if denominational teaching were forbidden in government-aided schools, Catholic schools would close down before they would eliminate doctrinal teaching. "Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle", Tablet, XXXIV (5, June, 1869) p. 27.

This stand was conservative and defensive: the Catholics were trying to defend the existing system against those who were trying to replace it. Because their attitude was conservative it was less original than the liberal viewpoint of the National Education League. The Catholics had few ideas to match the radical proposals of the League. The former's main desire was to resist innovation in religious teaching, while the latter suggested an almost completely new blueprint for elementary education.

Any new proposals put forth by the Catholics were, at root, attempts to save the old denominational system of elementary education and certainly not suggestions for new systems. The Catholics realized that some new procedures would have to be initiated to rectify the great educational deficiency. But they wanted these procedures to complement rather than replace the old system of education. One plan, which would have effected this, was suggested by Masmyth Scott Stokes, an inspector of the Catholic schools in north-west England.⁸

Mr. Stokes proposed that the existing sectarian schools should set up auxiliary schools wherever there was a deficiency. Under his plan, the sectarian managers of existing central schools would determine the school shortage in the area which surrounded their schools. Then they

⁸
 "Mr. Stokes Plan", Tablet, XXXIV (19, June, 1869), p.80.

would see that supplementary schools were built to relieve the deficiency. The managers of the old central schools would also be responsible for the administration of the new auxiliary schools which they had had built. And they would take measures to ensure that the methods of the new schools resembled those of the old school. The Stokes plan combined a needed increase in schools with the preservation of the old denominational schools. For this reason, it was acceptable to Catholic educators.

The Stokes plan gained considerable acceptance in Catholic circles. Archbishop Manning, himself, requested that Catholic schools should establish auxiliary schools. An education committee which Manning organized gave some support to the Stokes plan, and an outline of the plan was reprinted in the Catholic Poor School Committee Report.⁹ Also, some effort was made to have the Stokes plan accepted by non-Catholics. Canon Toole, a Catholic educator, presented it before a meeting of the Anglican-dominated¹⁰ National Education Union.

⁹ J. B. Rowe, "Elementary Education", letter to the Tablet of 18, May, 1869, ibid., XXXIII (22, May, 1869), p.988.

¹⁰ See his speech in "National Education Union-Congress in Manchester", Tablet, XXXIV (6, November, 1869), p.735.

The Stokes plan's wide acceptance among prominent Catholics illustrated that the only educational reform to which they would agree, would be one which extended the existing system. There was no place in the Catholics' conservative position for new systems of education.

II

Hence the Catholics were unalterably opposed to the radical education plan of the National Education League which proposed to abolish denominational education by initiating a new system. The Catholics found themselves in the less dramatic position of defenders of the old against modern League aggressors.

For each of the liberal principles with which the League attacked the old educational system, the Catholics had a conservative defense. For example, the League members assumed that it was the duty of the State to provide for the education of its subjects. The Catholics disagreed with that assumption. They maintained that natural law gave the right to educate to the parents and divine law made the Church the guardian of that right.¹¹ As Archbishop

¹¹
 "Bishop of Beverley on Secular Education",
 Pastoral of 30, May, 1869, Tablet, XXXIV (5, June, 1869),
 p. 26.

Manning pointed out, the Catholics believed that education was essentially a religious function. If the State appropriated the right to educate it acted as a tyrant who declared
¹²
 State supremacy in religion.

Another League principle which the Catholics opposed was that a comprehensive national system of education was so necessary that distinctive religious education could be sacrificed to gain it. The Catholics did not deny the advantages of united education. But they were not willing to sacrifice dogmatic religious teaching to achieve what they considered a lesser end. As Bishop W. B. Ullathorne of Birmingham said, because England was made up of citizens of differing beliefs, any educational system which ignored these differences would, in fact, be "anti-national".¹³ The Catholics answered the League proposal to reduce classroom teaching of religion to a common denominator, with a conservative plea for the place of religion in education. Archbishop Manning summed up the Catholic attitude on this problem:

An united system of schools may be expedient, but a religious teaching and training is vital. If the former can be given up, the latter cannot... . The people

¹²

H. E. Manning, "Pastoral, 1869", pp. 61-62.

¹³

W. B. Ullathorne's speech in "Meeting at Birmingham", Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 802.

62485

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

of England, in all their religious divisions are still resolved to hold fast, and to hand on their inheritance of Christian education The Catholic Church acknowledges no other. ¹⁴

The Catholics did not want to see the old education system replaced by a new League-inspired system because that would have meant the abolishment of distinctive religious teaching in elementary classrooms. But the Catholic objection to the League plan was not based only on this defense of denominational teaching: the Catholics aimed direct counter-attacks at the League's proposal to have "unsectarian" religious teaching in the schools. The Catholics regarded the League demand that only truths common to all Christians should be taught in the classrooms, as undesirable and unjust. They pointed to the supposedly unsectarian Irish National School System as an example of its injustice. Under that system the majority of the Irish, the Roman Catholics, were deprived of distinctive religious teaching out of defer-¹⁵ence to the Protestant minority.

Not only did the Catholics condemn the unsectarian religious teaching as unjust, they considered it impossible to achieve. Bishop Ullathorne pointed out that the proposal of the League to have classroom Bible-readings without doctrinal comment was unrealistic. He said that if the

¹⁴ H. E. Manning, "Pastoral, 1869", p. 62.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 61.

Bible were read and understood, it had to be interpreted.¹⁶
 And it was not possible to do this without doctrinal comment.
 The Catholics were opposed to any such softening of Christian
 dogma. As Archbishop Manning said: "religion without dogma
 is not Christianity".¹⁷

The Catholics were mainly concerned with the question
 of whether or not distinctive religious teaching would be
 allowed in the English elementary schools of the future.
 And they resisted League attempts to lessen the quality of
 that teaching. But the League did not only want to alter
 the quality of religious education; it also wanted to
 change the circumstances under which it was taught. This the
 League hoped to accomplish by enactment of a Conscience
 Clause. A legally enacted Conscience Clause would have
 stipulated that religious lessons had to be taught at times
 separate and distinct from the secular lessons. It would
 have provided that religious objectors could withdraw from
 the classroom during these religious lessons.

¹⁶ W. B. Ullathorne's speech in "Meeting at Birmingham", Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 801.

¹⁷ "Pastoral, 1869", p. 61.

Those Catholics who objected to the Conscience
 18 Clause did not do so because they were indifferent to religious conscience or because they wanted to proselytise non-Catholics. From the beginning of government aid to Catholic education, the spirit of the Conscience Clause had
 19 been, at least officially, voluntarily observed. Indeed, such a Conscience Clause would have, if universally applied, protected Roman Catholic children from proselytism in Protestant schools.

18

The more prominent Catholic prelates such as Archbishop Manning and Bishop W. B. Ullathorne opposed the concept of a legally enacted conscience clause. In a letter to Manning (11, February, 1868), Ullathorne wrote: I altogether agree with you that the conscience clause, education rate and compulsory education are harbingers of a general system of education for this country which to us would be absolutely ruinous". Cited in Christopher Howard, "Manning and Education", in Manning: Anglican and Catholic, John Fitzsimmons ed. (London: Burns, Oates 1951), pp. 102-103. But not all Catholic educators opposed the conscience clause as such. For example, Canon Toole of Manchester at a meeting of the National Education Union, spoke in favour of any conscience clause which would not hurt denominational education. In his speech in "National Education-Congress at Manchester", Tablet, XXXIV (6, November, 1869), p. 735.

19

In the Appendix to the Report of the Catholic Poor School Committee, for 1851, there is a letter from Bishop Walsh to Charles Langdale which states: "In the case the children of Protestant parents should resort to our schools, they will not be required to remain in the school at the time of religious instructions being given unless the parent or guardians have previously expressed their consent and approbation". Cited in "Letter from J. B. Rowe", Tablet, XXXIII (13, February, 1869), p. 507.

The Catholics generally feared a legal Conscience Clause lest it should lead to further changes: as Bishop Ullathorne said, it could be the wedge to let in the "secular" system of education.²⁰ In other words, a system might be established with any kind of religion or lack of it. Its proponents would argue that if the religious teaching offended the beliefs of parents, the Conscience Clause provided adequately for their religious sensitivity; they could withdraw their children from the religious classes. The Catholic authorities did not consider such negative protection of Catholic consciences sufficient. They insisted that their children receive a positive and Catholic religious training in a religious atmosphere.²¹ They resisted the Conscience Clause in order to save the old denominational system of education so that Catholic children could be educated in truly Catholic schools.

20

"Meeting at Birmingham", Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 801. Ullathorne is probably not really referring to a purely secular system but to the undenominational system advocated by the League which would permit the reading of the Protestant Bible. To the Catholic authorities, the latter system was almost as bad as the former and the two terms were often used interchangeably.

21

"The Theory of Denominational Education", Dublin Review, new series XIV (January, 1870), p. 6.

The Catholics' desire that their children should be allowed to receive full doctrinal training was reflected in the Catholic attitude on even essentially non-religious education questions. There were no direct religious implications in the League request that school attendance be made compulsory. But some Catholics opposed this proposal because of religious considerations. Catholic thinking did not oppose compelling children to attend school, as such. In fact, compulsion could have afforded the Catholic Church the opportunity to bring into its schools many illiterate Catholic children.²² The Catholics feared compulsory school attendance lest Catholic children be compelled to attend non-Catholic schools.

If new legislation were to forbid any school which received government aid to teach sectarian religion and if all children had to go to school, many Catholic children would not receive a religious education. Furthermore, even if Catholic schools were allowed by new legislation to teach their catechism, many Catholic children might still have to go to non-Catholic schools. Catholic financial resources were not substantial enough to provide adequate schooling for the great number of Catholic children who would suddenly be compelled to attend school for the first time. Those

22

The Prime Minister pointed out the Catholics as having the greatest problems of illiteracy. W. E. Gladstone, 16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 277.

Catholic authorities who opposed compulsory school attendance did not do so because they wanted to prevent Catholic children from receiving an education; they did so because they wanted to prevent them from receiving a non-Catholic education.²³

The Catholics used the same standard to test all of the current education questions: they asked what effect each would have on the right of Catholic children to receive a full Catholic education. They wanted to maintain the old denominational system because it protected that right.

III

Since the Catholics of England had such a definite stand in the education controversy, it was important that they make their voices heard. As a minority group, they could not expect to exert as much influence as the National Education League. But it was necessary that they marshal what pressure they could exert in a concerted manner. The situation called for them to form a national association to counteract the National Education League. The Catholics needed their own pressure group.

The Catholics already had the beginnings of such an association. Although the Catholic Poor School Committee

²³ This discussion is based on "The National Education Union", Tablet, XXXIV (30, October, 1869), p. 681.

existed primarily to oversee the building and maintenance of Catholic elementary schools, it was also expected to represent the Catholic educational claims to the government. This function was not an accidental one. When the Catholic bishops of England met for their annual synod in Low Week of 1869, they reaffirmed the principle which they had expressed in a letter in 1848 to Charles Langdale, the Catholic Poor School Committee's founder:

We recognize your committee as the organ sanctioned by us of communication with the government; and we have every confidence that your committee ... will be fully aware of our determination not to yield to the Ministers of the day any portion, however small, either of ecclesiastical liberty, or of episcopal control over the religious education of the children of the poorer members of our flock. ²⁴

The Catholic Poor School Committee was supposed to act as a kind of Catholic pressure group in matters which affected elementary education. But its ability to carry out this function was seriously limited by its organizational defects. On paper, the Committee's organization seemed quite adequate and comprehensive. Its executive was managed by an able president, Lord Howard of Glossop, and a competent secretary, T. W. Allies. ²⁵ The Committee was also

²⁴ Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster—in a letter to the Lord Edward Howard of Glossop (9, April, 1869), cited in "Bishop of Newport and Menevia on Education", Tablet, XXXIV (17, July, 1869), p. 221.

²⁵ There was some criticism that the secretary, Allies, received a salary. A Catholic curate, "Education of the Poor", Tablet, XXXV (29, January, 1870), p. 137.

composed of 45 members from throughout the kingdom: each of fifteen of the sixteen dioceses in England, Wales and Scotland sent one priest and two laymen to the Committee. But the full Committee met only once a year and in most of the dioceses there were no permanent sub-committees to work on a continuous basis with the central Committee in London. Consequently, the permanent sub-committee, which was made up of Committee members who lived in London and those who happened to be in London, was not comprehensive enough to exert co-ordinated influence of a national character. ²⁶

Because the Catholic Poor School Committee was not organized on an adequately comprehensive basis, its permanent officials had great difficulty in trying to gauge the Catholic educational resources and deficiencies. Nor could they adequately determine popular Catholic opinion on educational matters or marshal co-ordinated Catholic influence on educational legislation. Furthermore, since voluntary contributions played an important part in the Catholic education effort, some kind of united plan for their collection was most advisable. But the Catholics had no permanent national organization to accomplish this. ²⁷

²⁶ This discussion is based on "Catholic Organisation, National and Local", Tablet, XXXI11 (27, March, 1869), pp. 708-709.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 708-709.

There was a crying need that this situation be rectified. Lord Howard of Glossop and T. W. Allies supported a plan, publicized by the Tablet, which would probably have proved to be a solution to the problem.²⁸ They suggested that permanent education boards be set up in each of the dioceses. Not only would these boards send delegates to the annual meeting of the entire Catholic Poor School Committee in London, but they would co-operate throughout the entire year with the central committee. These permanent diocesan boards would fill important gaps in function: they would measure the climate of opinion in the area of their jurisdiction; try to influence legislation in favour of Catholic education; keep statistics on diocesan educational accomplishment and deficiency; and organize the collection of funds.²⁹

28

See T. W. Allies "The Catholic Poor School Committee and the Wants of Catholic Primary Education", letter, in Tablet, XXXVI (15, February, 1870), p. 232. In fact, according to a speech by Lord Howard, the C.P.S.C had been trying since, at least 1869, without success, to secure such an organization. In "The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 785.

29

These observations are based on "Catholic Organisation, National and Local", Tablet, XXXIII (27, March, 1869), pp. 708-709.

Lord Howard of Glossop pointed out that the Church of England, the Wesleyans and the Independents all had adequate organizations and that there was a greater need than ever, in the present conflict, for the Catholics to develop their resources to the utmost.³⁰ In speaking of the need for such diocesan boards, the Tablet spoke prophetically: "The sooner we anticipate the people in their tendency to the formation of local boards, the stronger we shall become... . If the nation next year is to face a crisis, it is well that Catholics should be prepared beforehand with a complete organisation".³¹

In spite of the combined efforts of Lord Howard and Allies and the unquestioned backing of the Tablet, no such adequate national organization was brought into being before the education legislation passed through Parliament. The month before the government introduced its Education Bill, Lord Howard of Glossop was still calling for diocesan co-operation in setting up local organizations and getting accurate statistics.³² But the bishops and their associates

³⁰ Lord Howard of Glossop, letter to the Tablet (15, January, 1870), ibid., XXXV (22, January, 1870), p. 107.

³¹ "Catholic Organisation, National and Local", Tablet, XXXIII (27, March, 1869), p. 709.

³² See his letters to the Tablet, 15, January, 1870 and 23, January, 1870, ibid., XXXV (22, 29, January, 1870), pp. 106-107 and p. 137.

did not answer these pleas until it was too late to change the Education Bill in the Catholics' favour.

It is apparent that the bishops recognized that it was their responsibility to set up diocesan education boards. At their Westminster synod in 1869, they yielded to the Poor School Committee's pressure and pledged themselves to set up such boards in every diocese. In a letter to the Committee, the bishops promised to organize councils of education to co-operate with the Catholic Poor School Committee in the collection and distribution of education funds. They also resolved to rectify another serious deficiency by forwarding statistics to the Committee, on a uniform principle.

But when the bishops said that this agreement "must be only tentative", they prefigured their failure to put these resolutions into effect.³³ For the most part, they did not set up diocesan councils of education until after the education legislation had been passed. Thus the defects in the Catholic Poor School Committee were not rectified in time to give that Committee the support and information it needed to present really knowledgeable briefs to those who were charting the future of elementary education in England. The bishops' failure to organize diocesan education boards

33

Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster - in a letter to the Lord Howard of Glossop (9, April, 1869), cited in "Bishop of Newport and Menevia on Education", Tablet, XXXIV (17, July, 1869), p. 221.

offered some proof of a complaint made by T. W. Allies that the Committee's suggestions to the bishops "have usually had the honour of being highly approved and the misfortune of not being carried out".³⁴

IV

Because they had no separate pressure group, the Catholics had to rely more heavily on the National Education Union to save the old denominational system of education. Both the Catholics and the Anglican-dominated Union were pledged to maintain the existing system. So co-operation between the two was inevitable.³⁵ But the absence of a national and comprehensive Catholic education society made this co-operation more vital to the Catholic cause.

The alliance of the Catholic education officials with the National Education Union was undertaken with the approval

³⁴ T. W. Allies, "The Catholic Poor School Committee and the Want of Catholic Primary Education", letter of 15, February, 1870, Tablet, XXXV (19, February, 1870), p. 232.

³⁵ In fact, even before Lord Howard of Glossop was made president of the Catholic Poor School Committee, he expressed the opinion that Catholics should not lead the fight for denominational education, but let stronger groups lead. Letter to the Tablet (19, March, 1869), ibid., XXXIII (27, March, 1869), p. 714.

of the Catholic hierarchy. Before Lord Howard of Glossop pledged the Poor School Committee's support to the Union, he consulted "high ecclesiastical authorities" to ask their permission. The Church officials urged them to support the association.³⁶ In fact Very Rev. Canon Toole of Manchester accompanied Lord Howard of Glossop and T. W. Allies to the first general meeting at Manchester. Canon Toole and the other Catholics shared the platform with the Union officials and spoke to those assembled.³⁷ In the months that followed, Catholic education authorities attended Union meetings on many occasions.³⁸

Although Catholic co-operation with the Union was useful because of their common purpose, it would not have been advisable for the Catholics to rely exclusively on that organization. They did not entirely agree with the Union platform and the Catholics and Anglicans were in different

³⁶ This information is contained in a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop in "The Education Bill - The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

³⁷ "National Education Union - Congress in Manchester", Tablet, XXXIV (6, November, 1869), p. 735.

³⁸ This information is contained in a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop, in "The Education Bill - The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

positions in English society. So it was necessary for the Catholics to take some independent measures to influence public opinion on the education questions.³⁹

The exertion of such independent pressure was made more difficult because there was no comprehensive Catholic education society. Consequently, the Catholic efforts to influence the framers of the education legislation were not like the League's and Union's co-ordinated on a national basis. Whatever Catholic action was taken in this respect came from individual and local initiative. The Catholic pressure group was united in spirit but not in organization. It was left up to the individual Catholic bishops and local lay groups throughout the country to do what they could to make the Education Bill one which did not harm Catholic interests.

For this reason, the bishops, as the real leaders of the Catholic community, had an important role to play. There was no question that Archbishop Manning assumed this role with considerable energy. He used his personal friendship with Prime Minister Gladstone to press the Catholic educational claims on the government.⁴⁰ He organized committees

39

This view was expressed by the Tablet in "National Education Union", ibid., XXXIV (30, October, 1869), p. 681.

40

Of his relationship with Gladstone, Manning said: "Mr. Gladstone is the man whose friendship has been to me one of the most cherished and valued of my life". "Letter to Mr. Davidson", cited in A. W. Hutton, Cardinal Manning, (London: Methuen 1894) p. 149. Gladstone and Manning had

and meetings to air the Catholic viewpoint in his own diocese of Westminster.⁴¹ And he used his influence to make the other English Catholic bishops aware of the seriousness of the situation.

But most of the other Catholic bishops did not share Manning's feeling of urgency. The bishops did not realize early enough that the impending education legislation presented the Catholics with a potential crisis.⁴² And even when Manning pointed this out to them at their synod in 1869, they did not do all that they could have to meet the oncoming crisis: in spite of their promises to do so they failed to set up diocesan councils of education and to forward educational statistics on a regular plan.⁴³

begun their relationship as school friends and their friendship became so warm that Gladstone asked Manning to become his eldest son's god-father. In 1851, when Manning became a Roman Catholic, Gladstone and Manning grew apart and never met for 12 years. In the last years, however, public and official duties had renewed their communications. ibid., p. 148.

⁴¹

See below p. 45.

⁴²

In 1869, Manning wrote to Archbishop Cullen: "A year ago I saw it coming, and tried without success to move the Bishops". Cited in Shane Leslie, Henry Edward Manning His Life and Labours (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1921), p. 173.

⁴³

See Lord Howard of Glossop's Letters to the Tablet of 15, January, 1870 and 23, January, 1870, ibid., XXXV (22, 29 January, 1870), pp. 106-107 and 137.

But to say that the bishops did nothing to prevent the oncoming legislation from hurting Catholic education would be incorrect. Some bishops used their pastorals to refresh the Catholic views on education in the minds of their own faithful and to present the Catholic position to non-Catholics.⁴⁴ Some bishops also organized meetings and had petitions sent to the government. Most of them did provide some leadership in the struggle to secure favourable treatment for Catholic schools.

The hierarchy's leadership in the education struggle was not to last long. In November, 1869, three months before the government introduced its Education Bill to the House of Commons, the Catholic bishops had to leave England to attend the Vatican Council in Rome.⁴⁵ Since they did not return

⁴⁴ Some of the more noteworthy pastorals on education, in 1869, printed in the Tablet are: the May 30 pastorals of the Bishops of Beverley and Hexham and Newcastle, "Bishop of Beverley on Secular Education"; "Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle", *ibid.*, XXXIV (5, June, 1869), pp. 26-27; Archbishop Manning's pastoral of June 6th, "Archbishop of Westminster's Pastoral", *ibid.*, XXXIV (12, June, 1869), pp. 61-62; and the pastorals of the Bishops of Shrewsbury and Newport and Menevia in July, 1869, "Bishop of Shrewsbury's Pastoral"; "Bishop of Newport and Menevia on Education", *ibid.*, XXXIV (17, July, 1869), pp. 220-221.

⁴⁵ Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 783.

until the Bill had been passed, the Catholics were without their natural leaders.⁴⁶ Their campaign to influence the education legislation had to be led by minor church officials and the laity.

The Catholic laity's participation in the education struggle both before and after the bishops left for Rome was less than overwhelming. Some Catholic laymen, such as Lord Howard of Glossop and T. W. Allies, did all they could to represent the Catholic claim,⁴⁷ but most lay Catholics did not do their part. Lord Howard of Glossop complained: "We Catholics, I am afraid, are disposed to be very modest and retiring, and we do not always come out when we might".⁴⁸

The Catholics of England in 1869 had some reason to be modest and retiring. Most were politically inexperienced and thus were not trained in the art of public influence.

⁴⁶ A. C. F. Beales, "The Struggle For the Schools", in The English Catholics 1850-1950, G.A. Beck, ed., (London: Burns Oates, 1950), p. 374.

⁴⁷ The Tablet praised the energy of Lord Howard of Glossop: "Lord Howard of Glossop, the President of the Poor School Committee, spares neither time nor trouble, and has very efficiently represented the Catholic cause in various parts of the country". "Catholic Organisation, National and Local", ibid., XXXIII (27, March, 1869), pp. 708-709. T.W. Allies was described as, "the greatest of Catholic lay leaders in the entire century". A.C.F. Beales, "The Struggle For the Schools", op. cit., p. 372.

⁴⁸ In his speech in "The Education Bill-The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 786. For a discussion of the Catholics general

Many were afraid to enter into public discussions lest they might renew the outbursts of anti-Catholic bigotry which they remembered so well.⁴⁹ Many of the Irish Catholics in England were so poor that they would not be interested in anything but securing a livelihood. Many, themselves unschooled, did not appreciate the advantage of education, Catholic or otherwise. And many were probably more interested in securing a bottle of liquor for themselves than an⁵⁰ education for their children.

apathy see "The Duties of Catholics in the Present Crisis", ibid., XXXV (22, January, 1870), p. 102.

49

E. S. Purcell characterized Archbishop Manning as an adherent of this type of thinking. He maintained that Manning "deprecated public meetings ... or the presentation of Catholic petitions to Parliament, or deputations of laymen to ministers in support of Catholic rights or interests. He feared lest such public action on the part of the Catholics might excite anti-Catholic bigotry and provoke a counter agitation. For the removal of Catholic grievances he relied on his personal influence with ministers, notably with Mr. Gladstone, with whom at this period he had renewed friendly relations". "Manning as a Catholic", Vol. 11, Life of Cardinal Manning (London: Macmillan, 1896), p. 383. Purcell, probably overstated his case: it will be shown that Archbishop Manning was the chief instigator of a series of popular meetings among London Catholics trying to influence the education legislation. See below p.45.

50

For a discussion of the Irish immigrants' extreme poverty and lack of temperance, see Denis Gwynne, "The Irish Immigration", op. cit., p. 279.

London throughout February obviously were organized by the same agency. It is furthermore clear that Archbishop Manning himself spear-headed these meetings. Sir George Bowyer, at a meeting on February, 8th, said that those present were "assembled in pursuance of a resolution formed by the Archbishop of Westminster and others, for the purpose of giving expression to their views on the subject of education".⁵²

That the procedure of the meetings followed an almost identical pattern illustrated their common origin. Speeches were given denouncing the proposed conscience clauses and local rating and supporting both the theory and results of denominational education in England. Also those gathered were asked to do everything they could to maintain the old system of denominational education, including co-operating with its Anglican and Wesleyan supporters.⁵³

52

"Meeting at Store Street Music Hall", Tablet, XXXI11 (13, February, 1869), p. 512.

53

In addition to the meetings already cited, see the February 1st meeting, "Catholic Education Meeting at Pimlico", Tablet, XXXI1 (6, February, 1869), p. 478; the February 8th meeting, "St. Mary's and Michael's Commercial Rd." ibid., XXXI11 (13, February, 1869), p. 512; February 23rd meeting, "Meeting at Kingsland School-Rooms", ibid., XXXI11 (27, February, 1869), p. 580; and the February 25th meeting, "Westminster" ibid., XXXI11 (6, March, 1869), p. 614.

Although most of the lay Catholics used their inferiority complexes as reasons for not entering the political arena, some were not reluctant to express the Catholic views on education. But since there was no national co-ordinated effort to influence public opinion, such expressions were localized.

V

To determine what the Catholics throughout England did to try to influence the education legislation before it was presented to the Commons, their local activities must be examined.

The popular Catholic movement in favour of Catholic education began in London in early 1869. The Tablet and the London Catholics expected, in February, 1869, that the education question would be taken up in the House of Commons that month. So the London Catholics began their meetings on February, 1st, 1869. On that day meetings were held in halls in Spitalfields and Pimlico. Very Rev. Dr. Gilber, the Chairman of the Spitalfields meeting, boasted that 60,000 Catholics were meeting in London in favour of denominational education on February, 1st.

These meetings and the others which took place in

⁵¹
⁵¹ "Catholic Education Meeting at Spitalfields",
Tablet, XXXIII (6, February, 1869), p. 465.

At these meetings the same two resolutions were passed. First, those present pledged their energy to support the Catholic cause in the education battle: "That this meeting acknowledges the necessity of upholding the Denominational system of Education, and pledges itself to support it by all lawful means, and to oppose every measure contrary thereto, and that it further pledges to oppose the eating and conscience clauses".⁵⁴

The second resolution promised financial and moral support for the existing Catholic schools: "As the religious and secular education of the poor is of vital importance to their future welfare, every effort should be made to assist the clergy in the discharge of this duty, both by subscribing to the schools and inducing negligent parents to send their children to them".⁵⁵

In spite of good intentions and early fervour,⁵⁶ the London Catholic popular movement for organized influence on the education legislation burned out after February, 1869.

⁵⁴ "Catholic Education Meeting at Spitalfields", op. cit., pp. 465-466.

⁵⁵ "Catholic Education Meeting at Pimlico", op. cit., p. 478.

⁵⁶ Rev. Mr. Macmullen said: "We must get up gigantic meetings, and petitions, if necessary". ibid., p. 478.

Unfortunately for the Catholic cause, it was not revived before the Education Bill came before the Commons. After February, 1869, popular Catholic initiative in the education battle passed from the southern Catholics in the London area to the northern English Catholics.

In about the middle of April, 1869, the Manchester Catholics initiated a movement at St. John's Hall. A resolution was adopted: "That a correspondence be entered into with the Catholics of the principal towns in England relative to the contemplated Bill for Popular Education and for the purpose of supporting the Denominational system".⁵⁷

The Tablet remarked happily that perhaps the uniform organization which it had been advocating was under way.⁵⁸ Such, however, was not the case. No positive results of resolutions of this kind were recorded.

On September, 21st, Manchester's Catholic neighbours across the Irwell River in Salford, held a sparsely-attended meeting at which they condemned the new scheme of education,

⁵⁷
p. 836. "Manchester", Tablet, XXXI11 (24, April, 1869)

⁵⁸
"Nothing could be more important than that Catholics should combine all their forces in the coming struggle for a Denominational system of education".
"Manchester", Tablet, XXXI11 (24, April, 1869), p. 836.

pledged their support to the old system, and declared their faith in the Catholic Poor School Committee.⁵⁹ That the attendance at this meeting was small gave evidence of the too-frequent Catholic inertia in championing denominational education in the political arena and of the difficulty the Poor School Committee had in marshalling support.

Probably the boldest Catholic meeting in support of denominational education, before the Bill was introduced, was the one presided over by Bishop W. B. Ullathorne of Birmingham, on November 15th, 1869. It was the boldest because it was held in Birmingham, the stronghold of the League. In the same town-hall where a month earlier the League had held its first massive meeting, the Catholics of Birmingham attacked the principles of the League and supported denominational education.⁶⁰

At this meeting "the hall was crowded to excess" and among other notables present were Lord Howard of Glossop and Lord Denbigh. Bishop Ullathorne claimed that the League was

59

"Denominational v.s. National Education", Tablet, XXXIV (25, September, 1869), p. 540.

60

The two day League meeting was held in the Birmingham Town Hall on the 12th and 13th of October, 1869. By the time this meeting had taken place, the League boasted of 2500 "influential" members including 40 M.P.s and 300-400 clergymen. It had branches in London, and seventeen other towns, as well as Birmingham. Twenty citizens of Birmingham had pledged 14,410 pounds sterling. J.W. Adamson, op. cit., p. 349.

trying to put a system of compulsion, local rates and a popularly-elected board in the place of parental responsibility for education. He said that the system of education which the League described as unsectarian was in reality the most sectarian of systems. It expressed the principles of that sect which does not believe in creeds. To force Catholics to pay for and attend such schools would be to raise the penal law again.⁶¹

The boldness of the Birmingham Catholics got results: not only were accounts of this meeting and of the Bishop's statements carried in the Catholic press, but they were printed in full in The Times and Spectator. Bishop Ullathorne was experienced in education conflicts and what he said was newsworthy. The effort by the Birmingham Catholics to influence the framers of England's future elementary education system got national coverage.⁶²

All of these meetings were held to influence the education legislation before it reached the House of Commons. But the Catholics of Liverpool recognized the need to influence the members of the House of Commons while they determined what changes should be made in the Bill. Hence on

⁶¹ In "Meeting at Birmingham", Tablet, XXXIV (20, November, 1869), p. 800.

⁶² Dom Cuthbert Butler, The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1926), Vol. II, p. 144.

February 7th, 1870, the day before the "Speech from the Throne" formally announced the oncoming educational legislation, they held an important preliminary meeting. At that time, representative English Catholics gathered to determine what should be done in the forthcoming education conflict. The enthusiasm of the more influential Liverpool Catholic was greater than had been hoped for: a circular convening the meeting had been sent out by the Liverpool Vicar-General. Although only 80 circulars had been sent out, 100 people attended.⁶³

Those present formed a committee for the promotion of Catholic educational claims. It consisted of men holding every shade of political opinion - Conservative, Liberal and Home-Ruler.⁶⁴ These Liverpool Catholics were willing to put aside political considerations to secure Catholic schools for Catholic children.

For the next ten days, the Liverpool Committee and other interested Catholics all over England anxiously waited for W. E. Forster, the Vice-president of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, to introduce his Education

⁶³ "Important Preliminary Meeting of the Catholics of Liverpool, Tablet, XXXV (12, February, 1870), p. 211.

⁶⁴ Thomas Burke, Catholic History of Liverpool (Liverpool: C. Tinling, 1910), p. 187. On St. Patrick's Day 1870, a month after the government had introduced its Bill the Liverpool Catholics held a massive meeting in the Theatre Royal. loc. cit.

Bill to the House of Commons. The Catholics, like their colleagues in the National Education Union, hoped that the Bill would prove to be conservative. They prayed that the government would not be unduly influenced by the liberal innovations of the National Education League. The future of Catholic elementary education depended on what Forster would say.

CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND THE PRESSURE GROUPS

I

W. E. Forster finally presented his Education Bill to a crowded House of Commons on February 17th, 1870. Prime Minister Gladstone had left the drafting of the Bill to Forster and now he let him present its details to the lower house.¹

The purpose which Forster attributed to the Bill was a liberal one. He said that the Bill had been brought forward: "... to bring elementary education within the reach of every English home, ²aye, and within the reach of those children who have no home". But the principle which Forster said lay behind his Bill was conservative. Forster showed no intention of replacing the old system of elementary education with an entirely new system. Instead, he proposed to retain and supplement the existing denominational system: "Our object is to complete the present voluntary system, to fill up gaps, sparing the public money where it can be done without,

¹ John Morley, The Life of William Ewart Gladstone, 3 vols., (London: Macmillan, 1903), Vol. II, p. 301.

² 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols 463-464.

procuring as much as we can the assistance of the parents, and welcoming as much as we rightly can the co-operation and aid of those benevolent men who desire to assist their neighbours."³

In other words, the government was willing to let the sectarian school managers carry on with the elementary education of the English children, provided that they would fill in their deficiencies. But the discovery of these deficiencies presented a problem. One of the main faults of the existing system was the lack of co-ordination between the education officials of the various denominations: there was no uniform plan of determining the educational needs of a given district. Forster proposed a formula to solve this problem. England and Wales were to be divided into educational districts. Each district was to submit a report on the number of scholars and the number of children of school age within that area. Then inspectors from the central Department of Education were to be sent to determine the efficiency of the district's schooling. If a certain district were judged to have reached a sufficient and efficient level of elementary education, that district would be left as it was under the existing system. If, on the other hand,

³ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 443. Italics added.

another district lacked adequate schooling, that area's denominational education authorities would be given a year of grace to eliminate the deficiencies.⁴

This part of Forster's plan was, indeed, conservative. The sectarian school managers were to be allowed to keep the existing system as it was, if only they could muster the resources to fill in its gaps within a year. And they were to be subsidized in that attempt with government building grants.

But if the sectarian authorities failed to bring a certain district's schooling to the specified standards, changes would be made in the existing system. In this event, the government stipulated that a new type of school should be set up to compensate for the sectarian school managers' inaction. This new class of schools was no longer to be under the management of officials appointed by the various sects. Instead, a new authority was to be instituted - the local school board. These school boards were to be chosen not through ecclesiastical appointment, but by municipal appointment.⁵

⁴ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 450.

⁵ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 451-453.

Forster's disposition of the problem of school management was a compromise. The sectarian school authorities were to be allowed to continue managing their own schools as before but a new kind of school management, conducted by secular school boards, was to be inaugurated. Forster's Bill gave birth in England to the dual system of elementary education where the publicly controlled board school sat beside the denominationally controlled voluntary school. Henceforth there were to be two kinds of elementary schools in England - the old denominational school and the new board school.

There were several problems which were attached to the initiation of a new kind of school. One problem was how to finance these new board schools. Previously, English elementary schools had been maintained by a combination of fees paid by parents, government grants and voluntary donations made by the religious denominations. This method of financing was still suitable for the denominational schools which were to operate in the future as they had under the old system. But the various religious sects could not be expected to provide donations for the new secularly-controlled board schools. Some new source of income had to be found for these schools to replace the churches' voluntary contributions. Forster's answer was to have the new board schools supported in part by rates levied on a local school district. And in addition to the money which the board school got from

the local rates it was to receive two of the three traditional⁶ sources of support, parental fees and government grants.

The denominational schools were to be maintained as before by parental fees, government grants and voluntary contributions. But they were to be allowed a potentially substantial additional source of income. The local school boards could, if they chose, make local rates available to these schools under sectarian management. The new local rates would definitely go to the new board schools but they might, in certain cases, also go to the old denominational schools.⁷

II

The provision, administration and financing of schools were not the only problems which Forster had to encounter in his Bill. It was not enough to build and maintain schools: some way had to be found to see that the new school-places were occupied. A plan had to be devised to make the mass of illiterate children attend school for the first time. But compulsory school attendance was, at that time, a controversial matter. If the government had decided to force all

⁶ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 455.

⁷ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 456.

children of suitable age to go to school, it might have encountered considerable adverse criticism. Yet some kind of compulsion was necessary. Forster decided to pass the problem on to the local authorities. The new school boards were to be given the choice to adopt or refuse the principle of compulsory attendance. Thus Forster's Bill allowed the school boards permissive compulsion: if they wished, they could compel the children within their jurisdiction to attend school.⁸

The old sectarian school managers were not to be given this right to compel school attendance. But a safeguard was included in the Bill to protect their interests against possible infringement by the new school boards. If the school board compelled a certain child to attend school, that child was to be given his choice of school. This meant that no child could be forced into a board school if he were being educated at a suitable denominational school.⁹ This safeguard was another instance of the conservatism apparent in Forster's Bill.

⁸ See "A Bill to provide For Public Elementary Education in England and Wales", (Clause 66), in Appendix C. Hereafter referred to as "Education Bill".

⁹ See "Education Bill", (Clause 66), in Appendix C.

The most dramatic illustration of this conservatism was in Forster's treatment of the controversial religious question. The old denominational schools were not to be under the jurisdiction of the new school boards. Thus they were to have no new restrictions put on their rights to fully teach their sectarian doctrines. But certain peripheral restrictions were to be placed on them. Henceforth all schools (both those controlled by sectarian managers or by school boards) were to allow government inspectors, of any religion, into their schools. No longer were the various religious sects to have the right to veto the appointment of government inspectors or to ensure that the inspectors who were sent to a certain school were of the same religious disposition as the school under inspection. But a new safeguard was to protect the schools' religious rights: the government inspectors could not, without permission of the school managers, examine the students in religious knowledge.¹⁰

Furthermore to protect the religious sensitivities of those students at schools which did not teach their own religion, all schools which received grants from the central government would now have to observe a legally-enacted Conscience Clause. Under that proviso, no student could be

¹⁰
447. 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 446-

forced to attend religious exercises or lessons or observe acts of religion, provided that he had a written statement from his parents excusing him from such attendance or observance.¹¹

These two restrictions could cause no serious limitation on religious teaching in the denominational schools. Those schools could still teach their own doctrines and religious beliefs. To have seriously limited doctrinal teaching in the denominational schools would have eliminated their raison d'être: the religious sects would not have put forth the extra effort to build their own schools if they could not have freely taught their religious tenets. But the new board schools were to be under the management not of religious sects but of secular school boards. Hence the problem of what religious teaching should be allowed in the new board schools was more difficult.

To solve the controversial religious question in relation to the new board schools, Forster could have chosen any of three plans. He could have decided to make the board schools secular and forbid any teaching of religion; he could have proposed that only religious beliefs which were common to all Christians could be taught in the board schools; or that one board school could teach one religious formulary while others could teach other beliefs.

¹¹

See "Education Bill", (Clause 7), in Appendix C.

But Forster chose none of these. The only definite stand he took on the three alternatives was that he would not support purely secular education. He said it would be a "monstrous thing" to have the Bible, "the foundation of the religion we profess", the only book excluded from the schools.¹² Instead, he proposed that the school boards themselves would be allowed to decide the nature of religious teaching in the board schools. He argued that the Education Act should place no more restrictions on the board managers than had been imposed on the managers of the old voluntary schools.¹³

This was a conservative settlement of the religious question. Conceivably, an Anglican-dominated school board could decide to have Anglicanism taught in its schools or a board dominated by the Dissenters could have Dissent taught or it could be decided to have some kind of "unsectarian" religious teaching or even to have purely secular education. In many cases, the religious teaching in the new board schools would be as sectarian as in the old denominationally-controlled voluntary schools.

¹²
458. 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 457-

¹³
17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 457.

III

The essential conservatism of Forster's Bill made it compatible with many demands of the National Education Union. The Union had asked that the old denominational system be maintained and completed. Forster, in his Bill, had guaranteed that the old system would not be replaced by a new one. It would merely be supplemented by new locally controlled board schools. In fact, the sectarian school managers, whom the Union represented, were even given a year to rectify their educational deficiencies and prevent the building of board schools.

The financial aspects of Forster's Bill only partly followed the Union plan. On the one hand, Forster had agreed with the Union that parental fees should not be abolished to make way for free schools. On the other hand, he had also partially accepted a financial principle which the Union had condemned. The new board schools were to be supported, in part, by rates levied on a local area. But Forster's acceptance of the principle of local rates was not as harmful as it might have been. The sectarian schools, which the National Education Union represented, were given the opportunity to share in the local rates. If the Anglicans, for example, could exert enough influence on the local school boards, Anglican schools could receive a share of the local

rates. Not only were the sectarian school managers guaranteed that they would continue to receive government grants, they could even share in the local rates which they had opposed.

Forster's treatment of the "religious question" also played into Union hands. The old sectarian schools were still to be able to fully teach their distinctive doctrines, although now they had to accept a legal conscience clause and submit to unsectarian inspection in non-religious subjects. Furthermore, even the new board schools might teach sectarian religion if enough Union supporters sat on the school boards.¹⁴

Although Forster's Bill favoured the Union more than it did the League, the Union had strong objections to the Bill as it stood. Lord Robert Montagu, a Union spokesman in the House of Commons, vehemently opposed the abrogation of religious inspection in the denominational schools. According to him, the various denominations had won the right to have inspectors of their own religion after long negotiations with the government. To violate these trust-deeds without recourse to the denominations was unjust.¹⁵

¹⁴ This discussion of the compatibility of Forster's Bill to Union demands is based on the previous discussions of the platform of the National Education Union. See above chapter 1, pp. 14-16, and of Forster's Bill. See above chapter 3, pp. 52-60.

¹⁵ 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 466-467.

Montagu also opposed the possible establishment of board schools without definite religious formulary. Since the people had shown that they preferred strictly denominational education,¹⁶ instead of trying to limit sectarianism, the Bill should give some guarantees that the new schools could be denominational. It was not enough to leave the problem to the school boards, for the school boards might not act in the best interests of all. For example, it was unlikely that a Liverpool school board would build a purely Roman Catholic school.¹⁷ One of the methods which Montagu suggested to protect the sectarian schools against the school board decisions¹⁸ was the Canadian plan of separate schools.

Montagu wanted to make an already Union-orientated Bill even more acceptable to the Union. But since it was apparent that the League would spare no effort to change the Bill in its favour and to purge it of any favours to sectarian education, Montagu and the Union lent their support to the original Bill.¹⁹

-
- ¹⁶
468. 17, February, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 467-
- ¹⁷
1998. 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 1997-
- ¹⁸
 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 2001.
- ¹⁹
 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1991.

IV

Although Forster's Bill, in abstract, favoured sectarian education, one segment of the National Education Union, the Roman Catholics, was far from pleased with it. They were happy that the Bill was conservative, but they expressed anxiety for the future results of the legislation on Catholic education.²⁰

The Roman Catholics were in a different position from their colleagues in the Union, the Anglicans. The Anglicans could expect to exert considerable influence on the new school boards in the towns and great influence on the rural school boards. So Anglican schools would be built and supported out of the new local rates. But the Catholics, as a minority group, could not expect to control any school board; therefore probably no Catholic school would be built or supported out of the local rates.

20

In a letter to W. E. Forster (7, March, 1870), Archbishop Manning said: "I am very anxious: I see that the Bill is conservative and provides for the moment. But I fear the lean kine will eat up the fat kine. In America the Bishops have formed their own schools to avoid the common school system. We in our poverty should be forced to do the same". Cited in Shane Leslie, Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1921), p.174.

With the absence of any Catholic control on the local school boards, the new board schools would be Protestant schools. Since the Catholic authorities would not permit Catholic children to attend non-Catholic schools, the new board schools would be of no use to them. The Catholics then would have to depend solely on their own schools for the education of their children. But Catholic schools were too inadequate to take care of all Catholic children. Therefore, if they wanted to keep their children out of the Protestant board schools, they would have to rectify their own educational deficiencies. Forster's Bill permitted them to do this and provided that they would be helped to build new schools by government building grants. But the Catholics did not consider the formula which had to be followed to qualify²¹ for these grants to be equitable, and they did not think that a year was long enough to rectify their great educational deficiency.²²

21

T. W. Allies, the Catholic Poor School Committee secretary, pointed out that the Act allowed the new board schools to borrow money for a term up to thirty years, obligating the ratepayers to pay the interest on the loan. Conversely, the Catholic schools were not allowed long-term financing; the Privy Council building grant had to constitute the last payment on the school debt. T.W.Allies "The Education Bill, Its Bearing on the Past, Present and Future" (a letter of 7, March, 1870) in Dublin Review, new series, XIV (April, 1870), p. 436. Also, see "Education Bill", (Clause 50), in Appendix C.

22

In a letter to W. E. Forster (20, March, 1870), Manning pleaded: "Give me time and just proportionate help

The board schools, for their part, were to continue receiving government building grants indefinitely and were to be allowed a new source of income for building and maintenance, the local rates. T. W. Allies said that the Bill sanctioned inequality in both the building and maintenance of schools and provided: "a cope of lead for the denominational schools; a pair of wings which will carry anybody, however weighted, for the board school, which moreover is to be fitted up with all the best educational apparatus, including a religious or an irreligious teaching according to the choice of the town councillors, or vestry, who appoints the managers."²³

The Catholics feared that this inequality in distribution of school funds would result in their children being forced to attend the non-Catholic board schools. It was expected that at least the school boards in the large industrial towns where most English Catholics lived would choose to accept the laws of permissive compulsion which the Bill allowed them. Theoretically, the mass of Catholic children who would now be forced into school for the first

and there will not be one of our children without a school". Cited in Shane Leslie, op. cit., p. 174.

²³ T. W. Allies, "The Education Bill, Its Bearing on the Past, Present and Future", op. cit., p. 436.

time could go to efficient Catholic schools. But Catholic financial resources were not considered great enough to provide the needed schooling. Thus, Catholic children might be compelled to attend the board schools. Archbishop Manning wrote in protest to Prime Minister W. E. Gladstone: "... No compulsory education can be just unless the faith and conscience of the people be respected. ... I am afraid that a small but persistent school are prevailing against the sense of the great majority of the English people. ..."

The Catholic grievances with the Bill made it natural that they should work to have the Bill amended so that it would be less harmful to Catholic education. The week after the Bill was introduced, the Catholic Poor School Committee, at an emergency two-day meeting, estimated the effect of the Bill on Catholic interests:

That it is the opinion of this meeting that the Bill on Elementary Education, lately introduced into the House of Commons, will, if it becomes law in the present form, be dangerous to the faith and religion of the poorer Catholics, from their number and position and inability to help themselves, and that it is the duty of Catholics to make every effort to have improvements introduced into it. 25

²⁴ Letter (6, April, 1870), cited in E. S. Purcell, op. cit., Vol. 11, p. 493.

²⁵ "Catholic Poor School Committee" Tablet, XXXV (26, February, 1870), p. 270. The Committee members also suggested a petition to be sent to the House of Commons from all of the English Catholic parishes: ... "That your petitioners see with regret that the Bill for Primary

V

Since the English Catholic hierarchy was in Rome during the time of legislation, the bishops had to follow the progress of the education contest from that distant vantage point: they held meetings to discuss the legislation and Archbishop Manning continued to press the Catholic claims on the government officials by letter.²⁶ But the immediate work of influencing legislation was left to the minor ecclesiastical officials and the executive of the Catholic Poor School Committee.

Lord Howard of Glossop and T. W. Allies contacted the English Catholic Vicars-General of various populous dioceses, as well as other interested lay and clerical leaders, and from them they obtained a composite picture of

Education, which has lately been introduced into your Honourable House, does not promote the extension of the existing system as they would desire.

That they pray your Honourable House that in any law which you may enact, you will retain that religious freedom under which the children of the poor are now educated, and that you will not pass any measure which would compel the poor of the Catholic community to send their children to schools in which the discipline and course of instruction would be a violation of conscience and a spiritual injury to them as Catholics". Tablet, loc. cit.

26

A. C. F. Beales, "The Struggle For the Schools", op.cit., p. 374.

the Catholic views in the education contest. Lord Howard also wrote directly to the English bishops in Rome to get their opinions. From the information which they obtained from these enquiries, they were able to draw up several papers which they distributed to members of parliament and other influential persons.²⁷ Also, to compensate somewhat for the lack of a permanent national Catholic education association a Special Committee, which included Lord Howard of Glossop, T.W. Allies, the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Petre, Canon Toole and Fathers Vaughan, Rowe and Macmullen, was appointed to watch²⁸ the Bill through Parliament.

Not all of the Catholic influence was indirect: during the parliamentary debates, Lord Howard and his associates had personal interviews with W. E. Gladstone once, and W. E. Forster and Lord de Grey twice.²⁹ But unfortunately for their campaign, the only English member of the House of Commons, who was admittedly a Roman Catholic, Sir John Simeon

27

This information is contained in a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop, in "Catholics and the Education Bill - Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

28

"Catholic Poor School Committee", Tablet, XXXV (26, February, 1870), p. 270.

29

This information is contained in a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop, in "Catholics and the Education Bill - Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

died before the legislation was passed.³⁰ Hence, the English Catholic authorities had to depend on the Irish Catholics to press their claim. Lord Howard summoned the ten Irish members to map out the strategy which they would take in the House of Commons. Two were appointed to give speeches delineating the Catholic grievances with the Bill.³¹ But when

30

Ibid., p. 784. Although Sir John Simeon was the only admitted Roman Catholic, Lord Robert Montagu was at least moving towards Catholic Church membership. He, himself, stated that he was no longer an Anglican. 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1981. During the debate over the education legislation Montagu either was a Roman Catholic already or on his way to conversion to that church. The article in The Dictionary of National Biography (Twentieth Century), Vol. 11, p. 639, states that Montagu became a Catholic in 1870 but it does not give the date of conversion. If Montagu had turned Catholic at the time of legislation, the Tablet did not admit it. (The first mention of Montagu's conversion in that newspaper was not until January, 1871. "Lord R. Montagu and Mr. Gladstone". Tablet, XXXVII (7, January, 1871), p. 4.) But the Tablet's lack of mention of Montagu's conversion during the education legislation does not preclude the possibility that Montagu was a Roman Catholic at that time: it would have been politically shrewd for the Tablet to keep Montagu's Catholicism a secret.

Whether Montagu was on his way to conversion or had been converted, he did not stray from the Anglican and Catholic stand on the education question. See above, pp. 62-63.

31

This information is contained in a speech by Lord Howard of Glossop, in "Catholics and the Education Bill-Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House, Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 784.

the Catholic member, a Mr. O'Reilly, stood up to speak on March 17th and 18th, he was not recognized. The Tablet claimed that no Catholic member of the Commons spoke out during the legislation.³² The situation in the House of Lords could have been better, but it was not. Although twenty-five Catholic peers were allowed in the Lords, only six bothered to accompany Lord Howard of Glossop during the debates on the Bill.³³

Catholic efforts to influence legislation, on the local level, were heightened somewhat after the Bill had been introduced. But lingering apathy, lack of national coordination, and the absence of the bishops made the local meeting and petitions something less than overwhelming. Furthermore, what popular action there was, on the local level, was restricted to the north of England and to Wales.³⁴

³² "The Education Question", Tablet, XXXVI (6, August, 1870), p. 159.

³³ Ibid., p. 159.

³⁴ The Tablet was published in London and mentioned all Catholic activity of any importance in the London area. The Tablet did not mention any popular Catholic education meetings in southern England during the legislation.

The meetings were spear-headed by a massive St. Patrick's Day meeting in Liverpool, which enthusiastically supported Catholic education claims and sent a delegation to wait on Mr. Forster. Other Liverpool meetings were held throughout the education contest.³⁵ In March the Catholics at Cardiff, Wales held a meeting and sent a petition to the government signed by 1,100 Catholics.³⁶ In April, the Catholics of Manchester, at a meeting attended by the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Howard of Glossop, pledged their resistance to the League demands which were then being made.³⁷ In May the Yorkshire Catholics held a meeting at Leeds and sent a petition to the government.³⁸ The most impressive meeting was held on

³⁵ See "The Great Catholic Meeting at Liverpool", Tablet, XXXV (26, March, 1870), and Thomas Burke, Catholic History of Liverpool (Liverpool: Tinling, 1910), pp. 187-189.

³⁶ "Meeting of Catholic at Cardiff", Tablet, XXXV (24, March, 1870), pp. 403-404.

³⁷ "Great Catholic Meeting at Manchester", Tablet, XXXV (30, April, 1870), pp. 563-564.

³⁸ "Meeting of the Yorkshire Catholics", Tablet XXXV (14, May, 1870), pp. 656-659 and "Beverley-Petition to the House of Commons", ibid., XXXV (18, June, 1870), p. 783.

June 13th, 1870, at the Duke of Norfolk's House. The most prominent lay Catholics in England were represented at this meeting which pledged itself to fight for equality for Catholics in education.³⁹

The Catholic letters, papers, petitions, articles, delegations and meetings had much in common: they protested the possible inauguration of secular or unsectarian schools and they requested better financial treatment for Catholic schools. In March, 1870, Archbishop Manning tried to obtain equal treatment for all schools. He wrote in a letter to W. E. Forster: "I do not see why the school rate should not be granted in proportion to private efforts by enactment of Parliament."⁴⁰ The next month, at its annual full meeting, the Catholic Poor School Committee pleaded for exceptional aid to Roman Catholic schools. They argued that the absence of adequate financial resources and the presence of a million poor Irish immigrants put the Catholic education authorities in an exceptional position which could be met only by exceptional aid. Some members at the meeting maintained that the Canadian plan, which allowed Separate Roman Catholic schools to share in government grants as well as in local taxes,

³⁹ See "The Education Bill - The Meeting of Lay Catholics at Norfolk House", Tablet, XXXV (18, June, 1870), pp. 783-786.

⁴⁰ Manning's letter to Forster (20, March, 1870), cited in Shane Leslie, op. cit., p. 174.

should be adopted in England. They, unhappily, contrasted the proposed English system of education with the Canadian one. Instead of sharing in local education taxes for their Catholic schools as their Canadian counterparts did, English Catholics would have to support their own schools and pay local taxes for board schools which they could not, in conscience, use.⁴¹

In spite of such wishes to have Forster's Bill amended in their favour, the Catholics did support the Bill. It was an essentially conservative Bill; it did maintain denominational education with few restrictions on religious teaching and it did allow them a year to put their educational house in order. When it became apparent that the National Education League was working feverishly to have the Bill changed in its favour, the Catholic support for the government's education legislation was even stronger.⁴²

⁴¹
"Catholic Poor School Committee", Tablet, XXXV (7, May, 1870), p. 589.

⁴²
See Lord Howard of Glossop's speech in "Great Catholic Meeting in Manchester" (22, April, 1870), Tablet, XXXV (30, April, 1870), p. 563. See also Canon Toole's speech in "On the Education of the People" (Manchester Meeting, 17, March, 1870), ibid., XXXV (26, March, 1870), p. 400.

VI

The essential conservatism of Forster's Bill though pleasing to the Anglicans and Catholics in the Union, alienated the League. The members of the National Education League resented the fact that Forster had not more completely accepted their plan to solve England's elementary education ills. They had asked that school deficiencies be filled immediately with board schools supported by local rates. Forster had answered that these board schools would be built only if after a year the sectarian school managers had not filled in their own deficiencies. The League members had asked that the new board schools be unsectarian. Forster had refused to limit the religious teaching in the board schools and provided that the local school boards would decide what religion would be taught in their schools. They had asked that parental fees would be abolished in the board schools and free schooling established. Forster had not done this. The League had asked that attendance in the new board schools be made compulsory. Forster had agreed that attendance would be made compulsory, but only if the local school boards chose to make it so.⁴³

⁴³ This discussion of Forster's Bill as related to the League demands is based on the previous discussion of the

It was not surprising then that those present at the Birmingham meeting of the National Education League on February 24th, 1870, expressed strong desire to have Forster's Bill amended. The resolutions which they proposed would have, had they been adopted, radically changed Forster's Bill. At the Birmingham meeting, the League members objected to the fact that denominational teaching was allowed to continue unrestricted: they said that in the existing denominational schools, religion should be taught at distinct times, before or after regular school hours.

The League further objected to the "year of grace" during which the government proposed to let the existing denominational schools rectify their own deficiencies with the aid of government building grants. The League resolution urged that school boards should immediately build schools in any place where there was a deficiency and that, in these schools, fees should be abolished and attendance made compulsory. Furthermore, it requested that school boards should be established at once all over the country, and not just where there was a deficiency.

The most controversial League demand - that no creed, catechism or tenet peculiar to any sect should be taught in

platform of the National Education League. See above chapter 1, pp.6-13 and of Forster's Bill. See above chapter 3, pp.52-60.

the new board schools - was again repeated. The League members objected to Forster's tactic of letting the local school boards decide the religious question: they wanted national legislation to ensure that the board schools everywhere would be unsectarian.

The League went so far as to publish their resolutions in the Catholic edited Tablet. Its advertisement outlined a petition embodying these demands, and it urged all supporters to forward their petitions to the House of Commons before March 14th, 1870, the night of the second reading of Forster's Bill.⁴⁴ On March 9th, 1870, the week before the second reading, the League sent a "very numerous deputation" to Gladstone, Earl de Grey and Forster. The government officials discussed the League demands at great length.⁴⁵

The National Education League was fortunate that its chief, George Dixon, was a member of the House of Commons. Dixon, personally, initiated the League strategy in the Commons. His first manoeuvre was to bring the religious question out in the open and, thus, delay the second reading.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ The preceding discussion is based on Francis Adams (League secretary), "National Education League-Resolution on the Government Bill" (Birmingham Meeting-24, February, 1870), Tablet, XXXV (5, March, 1870), p. 310.

⁴⁵ "Deputation of the League to Mr. Gladstone", Tablet, XXXV (12, March, 1870), p. 340.

⁴⁶ Vernon Harcourt, a League member, admitted that Dixon's amendment had been a delaying tactic. 18, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 200, col. 223.

He accomplished this by proposing an amendment which stated that: " ... this House is of the opinion that no measure for the elementary education of the people will afford a satisfactory or permanent settlement which leaves the question of religious instruction in schools supported by public funds and rates to be determined by local authorities".⁴⁷ With this amendment, the League challenged Forster's tactic of passing the religious question on to the local authorities to solve. Religious rivalries were in the open, and the legislature would now have to take a definite stand on the religious question. Would the denominational schools be allowed to continue unrestricted in their teaching of religious knowledge or would they, as the League advocated, have to confine their religious lessons to before and after school hours? Would the legislature decree that the new Board schools must teach definite creeds as the Union wanted, or unsectarian religion as the League wanted, or no religion as the Secularists wanted? The bickering in the Commons over these religious questions had the effect of clouding the more purely educational issues which pertained to Forster's Bill.

⁴⁷

15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1963.

VII

This religious quarreling was spurred on by the radical Dissenters led by Henry Winterbotham and Henry Richard. Winterbotham, "virtually the leader of the Non-conformists in the House of Commons",⁴⁸ and Richard, formerly an ordained Congregational minister,⁴⁹ disagreed with the moderate Dissenters who supported the National Education League. Their disagreement was centred around what religion, if any, should be taught in the board schools. The League had argued for "unsectarian" religious teaching which would allow truths common to all Christians to be taught in the board schools. The radical Dissenters of the complexion of Winterbotham and Richard went one step further: they maintained that no religious teaching should be permitted in the new Board schools.⁵⁰

Their position was explained during the debate over the second reading by Henry Winterbotham, M.P. for Stroud.

⁴⁸

"Winterbotham, Henry Selfe Page", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XXI, p. 693.

⁴⁹

"Richard, Henry", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XVI, p. 1094.

⁵⁰

15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1977 and 20, June, 1870, Vol. 202, col. 502.

Winterbotham said that Forster's Bill favoured the Church of England vis à vis the Non-conformist bodies: in the Anglican-dominated rural areas, the new school boards would be under Church of England control and that the local rates would go exclusively to that Church.⁵¹

Winterbotham's approach showed that the Dissenters saw more at issue than the religious disposition of schools. The Dissenters seemed to have wanted to lessen the power of the Established Church by diminishing its control over education. In this vein, Winterbotham launched a rather unrestrained and sometimes irrelevant attack on the Church of England. The essence of his attack was that the evils of the Established Church would be multiplied if the Anglicans were allowed to set up an Established Church in every rural school.⁵²

After he had hurled his brick-bats against the Establishment, Winterbotham gave the solution of the radical Dissenters to the religious question: a national system of united education for a people who do not agree on religious opinions must be secular.⁵³

⁵¹
1973. 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 1972-

⁵²
15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1975.

⁵³
1977. 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, cols. 1976-

Although the moderate Dissenters in the League and the radical Dissenters disagreed on whether the board schools should be unsectarian or secular, they were of one mind in their opposition to the denominational education which the Union advocated. Like the League members, the radical Dissenters wanted religious instruction in the old denominational schools to be limited to before and after school hours in order that objectors could withdraw from class during these religion classes.⁵⁴

The radical Dissenter's objection to giving any favours to denominational education became even stronger when W. E. Gladstone proposed to increase the central government's grants to denominational schools.⁵⁵ This intention by the Prime Minister was the catalyst which caused the explosion of the radical Dissenters' fury. They expressed this ire in an amendment put forth by Henry Richard which would have refused additional grants to denominational schools and would have made education in the board schools secular and compulsory: "Grants to existing denominational schools should not be increased; and that, in any national

⁵⁴ 15, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1979.

⁵⁵ The Prime Minister proposed to increase Privy Council grants to denominational schools by 50%, 16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 280.

system of education - the attendance should be everywhere compulsory, and the religious instruction should be supplied by voluntary effort and not out of Public Fund."⁵⁶

VIII

Gladstone's feelings were against the League and Secularists. A devout Anglican, he naturally sympathized with the desires of those who wanted to maintain denominational education. Although he had let Forster draft the Education Bill, he had asked that Parliament make no prohibition of religious teaching in the English elementary schools.⁵⁷ And the conservatism of this request showed clearly in the original Bill which Forster had presented to the Commons.

The Prime Minister's sympathies for sectarian education made him anxious for the future of the old denominational schools. He was especially concerned about the

⁵⁶

22, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 626. As Gathorne Hardy, a member of the Commons in favour of denominational education said, the wording of Richard's amendment was strange because Richard was simply asking for secular education. 20, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 518.

⁵⁷

Gladstone made this request in a letter (November 4th, 1869), to Lord de Grey, President of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education: "... Why not adopt frankly the principle that the State or the local community should provide the secular teaching, and either leave the option to

future treatment of the Roman Catholic schools. The Roman Catholics, he said deserved special consideration because of their special problems:

[Voluntary schools] ... raise controversy especially in connection with one portion of the community, whose case is the most difficult to deal with, whose case is also one which demands justice at our hands, and which cannot be overlooked - I mean the case of the Roman Catholics, who may be said to form 5 per cent of the entire population. I believe they assume that the proportion is higher; I take it at that. But that proportion by no means represents the share they ought to have in the operation of the Bill, because they are massed together in the great towns, and probably a tenth, an eighth, or even a sixth of the educational destitution sought to be relieved is that of the children of Roman Catholic parents. Of course, the fact that they would claim full denominational education in their schools would, in many cases provoke acrimony at the local Boards whether they should give aid out of the rates to denominational schools. 58

The Roman Catholics, as rate-payers, would have to pay for the maintenance of the new board schools, but as a minority group, they could hardly expect the local school boards to set up Catholic schools. Hence the Catholics, who were already a poor group, would have to maintain their own schools and also the board schools which they would not use.

the ratepayers to go beyond this sine qua non, if they think fit, within the limits of the conscience clause, or else simply leave the parties themselves to find Bible and other religious education from voluntary sources". John Morley, op. cit., Vol. 11, p. 300.

58

16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 277.

The treatment of voluntary denominational schools was, admittedly, a controversial problem. As Gladstone saw it, to prohibit or compel school boards to aid voluntary schools "would not be consistent with the view with which this Bill was brought forward". Yet it was unfair for parents of students at denominational schools to pay for their own schools and pay local rates for board schools as well. Gladstone's solution was to "sever altogether the tie between the local Board and the Voluntary schools". This would be done by increasing the Privy Council maintenance grants by fifty per cent. Under this new proposal, one half of the denominational schools' operating costs would be paid by the central government, one-third by parental fees and one-sixth by voluntary contributions. The financing of the new board schools would remain as it was under the original terms of the Bill, but the school boards would no longer have any connection with the denominational schools.⁵⁹

Although Gladstone, as Anglican, could try to help denominational education, Gladstone, as Prime Minister, had to try to get his Education Bill passed through Parliament. The obstacles which were put in the way of his intention to save what he could of the original Bill were not put there by

⁵⁹ 16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, cols. 277-280. This meant that the school board would not be able to make the local rates available to denominational schools.

the Conservative opposition: indeed, the leader of the opposition, Disraeli, said that he would support the original Bill.⁶⁰ Instead, members of Gladstone's own Liberal party, particularly the League supporters and Secularists threatened the passage of the Bill.

Gladstone became concerned for the life of the education legislation when George Dixon, the League chief, proposed his amendment which brought the religious controversy into the open. The Prime Minister feared that the religious wrangling which followed might kill the government's Bill.⁶¹ So in order to quiet the opposition, he yielded his first concession. The Conscience Clause would be made stricter: henceforth religious lessons in all government-aided schools, both the old denominational schools and the new board-controlled schools, would have to be given at separate and distinct times, during which periods religious objectors could withdraw.⁶²

⁶⁰ B. Disraeli, 16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 286.

⁶¹ During the debates both Gladstone (18, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 200, col. 292) and Forster (14, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 199, col. 1932) expressed fear that Dixon's amendment would cause a vote of division which might kill the Bill.

⁶² 18, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 200, col. 301.

Now, the first real restriction had been placed on denominational teaching. Gladstone seemed to believe that he had placated the opposition in his party. He said that although he would grant the stricter Conscience Clause, he would not agree with the League and Secularists that distinctive religious formulary should be excluded from the new board schools. This, he pointed out, would be to un-⁶³necessarily limit the local school boards' discretion.

But Gladstone was mistaken when he thought he had quieted his opponents. The opposition became louder and he had to make even more concessions to save the Bill. To compensate the League and Secularists for the increase in government maintenance grants to denominational schools, Gladstone proposed a limitation on the sectarian school managers. The period during which the denominational school managers were to be allowed to rectify their own deficiencies and prevent the building of board-controlled schools would be shortened from one year to six months. After the six months had passed, no government building grants would be⁶⁴ given to the denominational schools.

⁶³ 18, March, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 200, col. 302.

⁶⁴ 16, June, 1870, Hansard, Vol. 202, col. 281.

Also, Gladstone was forced to take back his refusal to prohibit distinctive religious formulary in the new board schools. Political pressure forced him to decide what kind of religious teaching should be allowed in board schools. He rejected both the Union position that all board schools should have denominational teaching and the Secularist position that religious teaching should be barred from the board schools. Instead, he accepted the League principle which now appeared to be a compromise. Truths common to all Christians could still be taught but: "No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the [board] school."⁶⁵

The Elementary Education Act which received Royal Assent on August 9th, 1870, differed greatly from the Bill which Forster had introduced about six months before. Although two amendments favoured the denominational schools, most of the legislative revisions were designed to please the League. Hence, the sectarian educators thought that the Bill had been changed for the worse. The Roman Catholics concluded that the golden age of elementary education was being

⁶⁵
 "The Elementary Education Act of 1870", (Clause 14, sect. 2), in Appendix D. Hereafter referred to as "Education Act".

replaced by a silver age. They feared that someday they
might have to meet an iron age.⁶⁶

66

"The Catholic Poor School Committee Report, 1872",
from "Catholic Primary Education in England", Dublin Review,
new series, XLX (April, 1872), p. 188.

CHAPTER IV

ROMAN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROBLEMS IN THE TWO YEARS AFTER THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870

I

The Roman Catholic education authorities regarded the Education Act of 1870 as a step backward. They had hoped that the religious freedom which Catholic schools had enjoyed under the old system would be retained under the new legislation. Instead, the Education Act had placed restrictions on the classroom teaching of religion. Henceforth, Catholic teachers could no longer give religious lessons whenever they wished; now they had to confine such lessons to the beginning and end of the school-day. But the Catholics did not think that this new difficulty was unconquerable. At least religion could still be taught. Adequate religious instruction could still be given, if teachers and managers resolved to do their utmost. Satisfactory religious training was still possible in the Catholic schools, but now it was more difficult.¹

But there was another class of schools where, the Catholic leaders thought, it was impossible to teach religion satisfactorily. The new board schools, which the Act

¹ Ibid., p. 185.

of 1870 introduced, had to give up distinctive religious teaching to qualify for local rates. These schools could still give unsectarian religious lessons based on such common Christian sources as the Bible and the Ten Commandments but they were not allowed to teach any religious tenets which were distinctive of a particular sect. The Catholics did not consider this indefinite religious training as adequate. Their bishops, in a joint pastoral, said that to use the Bible as a mere class-book was repugnant to its sacred character. And when the schoolmaster was allowed to add his own interpretation and comment to the bare reading of the Bible, the hierarchy claimed, the situation became even more intolerable. They said that they would not even grant training without religious morality and Christian doctrine the name education: it should be called national² instruction rather than national education.

The bishops wanted to ensure that no Catholic child would get his education at such 'godless' institutions. They issued a clear ultimatum that Catholics could not in conscience send their child to any non-Catholic school. But there was a chance that Catholic children might be forced into these schools. The bishops regarded this possibility

²
 "Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster Assembled". Tablet, XXXVII (3, June, 1871), pp. 688-689.

as a "violation of conscience so grave that, until we see it attempted, we shall not believe it possible that any School Board can attempt, or the Government ... permit it".³

The hierarchy's fear that Catholics might be forced into non-Catholic schools was not unfounded. The Education Act allowed school boards, if they chose, to compel children between six and thirteen to attend school. Since the school boards in the large industrial towns where most Catholics lived were expected to do this, thousands of Catholic children would now have to attend school for the first time. These children could, by law, choose an efficient Catholic school.⁴ But there were not enough such schools to accommodate the mass of illiterate Catholic children. And if they could not be educated in Catholic schools, they would be forced to attend non-Catholic schools.

The only way that the Catholics could keep their children from the "unsectarian" board schools was to put their own educational house in order. And they were given six months to do so. The Catholics regarded the situation as a crisis. In the words of Archbishop Manning: "The education of the people of England is, ... at this time

³ Ibid., p. 688.

⁴ See "Education Act", (Clause 74), in Appendix D.

passing through a crisis which, for good or for evil, will determine the future of this country."⁵

II

The Catholics would have to take definite steps to pass through this crisis successfully. They would have to determine the exact deficiencies, both in quantity and quality, of their elementary education. They would have to do what was necessary to make their existing elementary education reach the required level of efficiency; they would have to form a comprehensive association which would adequately co-ordinate Catholic elementary education; and most importantly they would have to organize a tightly-knit fund-raising campaign to build new schools.⁶

These problems were not created by the Education Act of 1870, they had been the preoccupation of the Catholic education officials before the Act was passed. But they were made more urgent by the Act. The English Parliament had, in effect, said that if the Catholics could not begin,

⁵ H. E. Manning, "Lenten Pastoral", Tablet, XXXIX (17, February, 1872), p. 205.

⁶ Each of these requirements will be discussed separately below, pp. 93-96.

immediately, to adequately educate their children, non-Catholics would do it for them.⁷

The necessary task of getting a sufficiently precise picture of the failings and accomplishments of Catholic elementary education was made difficult by the absence of regularly forwarded statistics. After the Education Act was passed, T. W. Allies, the Secretary of the Catholic Poor School Committee, had to estimate how many Catholic children were being educated, and how many were not. The number of known facts on which he could base this estimate was small: he knew that 70,034 Catholic students qualified for Privy Council grants and, thus, were receiving an efficient education and that about 25,000 other Catholic children were receiving some kind of education. But he did not know how efficient the education of the 25,000 children was or how many other Catholic children should have been in school, but were not. Hence, he was forced to calculate a rough estimate of the deficiency by an a priori formula. His conclusion that at least half of the Catholic children were without efficient schooling served the necessary purpose of stimulating Catholic education efforts. But the figures were not adequate enough to say what the exact deficiency of

⁷ If Catholic children could not be educated in Catholic schools, they could be forced by the school boards' rights of permissive compulsion to attend the non-Catholic board schools.

Catholic elementary education was in a given area. And this precise knowledge was necessary, if all the gaps in Catholic education were to be filled and Catholic children were to be kept from the board schools. The national Catholic education officials had to find some way to force the local officials to send them statistics.

Another problem which the Catholic officials had to face in this education crisis was how to make the existing schools more efficient. Any student who was not receiving an efficient education in a Catholic school might be forced to attend a board school. T. W. Allies was certain that not all of the 25,000 in Catholic schools which did not receive Privy Council grants, were being educated efficiently. Part of the reason for this, as he saw it, was that Catholic teachers were, too often, not adequately prepared. Frequently, to save money, school-managers did not encourage pupil teachers to go to training schools to become qualified teachers. Allies described such action as the most ruinous method of losing a pound to save a penny that could be devised. Not only would the Catholic child's attendance requirements not be fulfilled by lessons from ill-qualified teachers, but the schools in which they taught would not be

elegible for Privy Council grants. Furthermore, if the Catholic students could not be taught efficiently in Catholic schools, the parliament would amend the present Act, "with more and more disregard of religious consideration",⁹ in order to secure sound education for all English children.

To save Catholic education in the present and in the future the Catholic schools would have to maintain efficient teaching and this could only be accomplished by trained teachers. Allies argued that to ensure the employment of qualified instructors, they should be engaged by definite authority,¹⁰ not by the individual school-managers. But without a national and comprehensive Catholic education society, the definite authority which might have accomplished this did not exist.

The lack of a co-ordinated Catholic organ for the administration of elementary education in England was at the root of most of the other problems which the Catholic officials had to face in the crisis. The same defect which had dampened Catholic efforts to influence the education legislation now hampered Catholic efforts to meet the problems which that legislation had heightened. A comprehensive

⁹
Ibid., pp. 609-610.

¹⁰
Ibid., p. 610.

Catholic education authority could have made possible the submission of statistics following a regular plan; it could have ensured that only efficient teachers would be accepted; and it could have co-ordinated the Catholic efforts to raise funds to build and maintain schools.¹¹ The initiation of a comprehensive Catholic education society was essential in this crisis. But there was no guarantee that the diocesan officials would form the local supplementary education boards which were necessary to such an organization. The bishops had promised to set up these boards at their 1869 synod and they had not fulfilled their promises. Assurance was needed that they would do so now.

Although the need for a central organization was basic to all of the other problems which the Catholic educationalists faced, the need for money to build new schools was the most pressing problem. It was not enough for the Catholic authorities to bemoan the fact that the Education Act of 1870 had not treated the Catholic schools better financially: they had to either raise the money to build and rent more schools or see Catholic students in non-Catholic schools.¹²

¹¹ The need for such an organization was argued by the Poor School Committee officials. *ibid.*, pp. 611-612.

¹² Lord Howard of Glossop, "The Duty of Catholics With Regard to the Education Bill", *Tablet*, XXXVI (20, August, 1870), p. 244.

The Education Act of 1870 presented the Catholics with a challenge they could no longer put off. There was a feeling of anticipation among the Catholic education authorities when they were handed this challenge. They realized that the increased exertion which the Act made necessary might, in the long run, prove to be an advantage to Catholic elementary education. If they could provide efficient facilities for elementary education the Act offered a reward: for the first time, the mass of illiterate Catholic children would be compelled to go to schools, Catholic schools. As T. W. Allies said: "If we are equal to the occasion we may use the State's power to raise out of the mire those who have been lying so long in unreached ignorance".¹³ If they failed to meet the challenge, the future of Catholic education would be in jeopardy.

III

The Catholics did meet the challenge. First, they tackled the most pressing problem - the need to raise money. Fortunately for their cause, the Catholics had realized, even while the legislation was being discussed, that the Education

¹³ T. W. Allies, "Bearing of the New Education Act on the Catholic Population", Month, XIII, (November, 1870), p.612

Act would require increased financial exertion on their part. Since the Catholic hierarchy was in Rome at the time, the onus of organizing the money-raising activities was placed on the lay Catholics. On June 13th, 1870, the most prominent English lay Catholics met at the Duke of Norfolk's house to discuss what should be done. At that meeting, the Catholic Poor School Committee's executive helped form an association, called the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee, to raise money for new schools. The Duke of Norfolk, traditional leader of the old Catholic nobility, was appointed to head the committee. Since the Catholic Poor School Committee took part in forming the fund-raising organization and since Lord Howard of Glossop was the Duke of Norfolk's uncle, co-operation between the two associations was certain. But a greater co-operation was required: the lay leaders needed the support and help of the real Catholic leaders, the bishops. When the bishops returned from Rome, representatives from the Poor School Committee and the Crisis Fund Committee met with them to discuss the education crisis. Together, the bishops and the lay leaders planned the work of the Crisis Committee and laid out a plan for distribution of the funds which were being collected.

¹⁴
 This information is based on a speech by T. W. Allies, in "Public Meeting of the Education Crisis Fund Committee - Supplement to the Tablet", Tablet, XXXVI (20, August, 1870), p. 214.

The contributions which were given to the Crisis Fund Committee were collected mainly from the few rich Catholics who were interested in English Catholic elementary education, as a whole. Although, in total, this money represented a considerable amount, it was not enough to meet the crisis: it was advisable that the rest of the Catholic populace, also, make financial sacrifices. The Catholic education officials did make appeals to the Catholic people at large to give money for new schools, but there was no assurance that these appeals would be answered. Some way had to be found to guarantee that the efforts of the nobility-dominated Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee would be matched in every section of every diocese.¹⁵

To make sure that local money-raising efforts were at least equal to the Crisis Committee's the education officials used the power which the distribution of funds gave them. They stipulated that no money would be sent from the central Crisis Committee to any diocese which had not raised an equal amount of money, through its own exertions. Furthermore, a provision was made to guarantee that the dioceses put forth extra effort to meet the present crisis: the money which a diocese had to raise to qualify for a grant from the central Crisis Fund had to have been collected

15

Based on Lord Howard of Glossop, "The Education Crisis", Tablet, XXXVI (3, September, 1870), p. 298.

16
after June 13th, 1870. This meant that a certain diocese could not meet its financial requirement with money it had collected before the present crisis: it had to find new funds.

There was another source of money available to build new Catholic schools. The Education Act had provided that the Privy Council would continue to give building grants six months after the Act had become law. The Catholic education authorities urged lower school officials to make application for government building funds.¹⁷

16
"Report of the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee", Tablet, XXXVI (31, December, 1870), p. 852 (Clause X). This was one of the more controversial clauses of the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee's requirements. Although this demand proved that the Catholic Education Crisis Fund had been inaugurated to meet the present emergency, it penalized those Catholic areas which had foreseen the difficulties ahead and had begun constructing schools before June 13th, 1870. Furthermore, the C.E.C.F. drive drained, somewhat, the charitable resources so that it was difficult to finance a school which had been begun before June 13th, 1870. See William, Canon Browne, "Stanford Poor Schools: A Word of Explanation", Tablet, XXXVIII (11, February, 1871), p. 170.

17
The Tablet recorded Lord Howard of Glossop's request that it should, again, call its readers attention to Clause 96 of the Education Act which dealt with building grants. ibid., XXXVI (7, September, 1870), p. 372. Also, see "Education Act", (Clause 96), in Appendix D.

The answer to the problem of how to organize a comprehensive fund-raising campaign was obvious: the dioceses needed money to build new schools; the officials of the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee had part of the required money, so they could lay down the conditions on which the dioceses could receive it and they ordered that the dioceses make their own proportionate financial exertions. The Catholic education officials used the power of the purse to add more money to the purse.

IV

In a similar manner, the national Catholic education officials were able to force the diocesan officials to do something to solve other problems. For example, Lord Howard of Glossop and his associates used the machinery of the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee to ensure that gaps in statistical information would be immediately filled. The Committee ordered that before any diocese would be given Crisis Fund money, that diocese would have to submit a detailed report on its educational needs and accomplishments. This report had to include figures on the number of children accommodated already, the number of children to be accommodated and funds already on hand. It also had to

specify to what particular uses the money requested would go.¹⁸ For the first time, the Catholic educational officials could expect definite statistics forwarded on a regular plan.

The distribution of "Crisis funds" also gave the Catholic authorities the opportunity to make Catholic elementary education more efficient. In order to qualify for a building grant from the central Crisis Fund, diocesan officials had to meet two prerequisites: they had to appoint qualified teachers and they had to apply for the annual maintenance grant from the Privy Council.¹⁹ These two demands amounted to somewhat the same thing. The appointment of qualified teachers would directly improve the Catholic school's efficiency, and the application for Privy Council grants would pre-necessitate efficiency. These stipulations showed that the Crisis Fund Committee was not satisfied with just building and renting Catholic schools; the schools had to be efficient. This was the only way to ensure Catholic schools for Catholic children.

Another urgent problem which the Catholic education officials met was the lack of a national comprehensive Catholic education authority. To ensure that such an

¹⁸ "Report of the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee", Tablet, XXXVI (31, December, 1870), p. 852, (Clause LX).

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 851, (Clause V).

organization would be formed they ordered that before a diocese could receive Crisis Fund Committee grants it had to appoint a Diocesan Council of Education. This Council was to be composed of both clerical and lay members and was to co-operate with the central Catholic education councils. Together, they would be responsible for the application,²⁰ management and preservation of education grants. For the first time, the executive of the Catholic Poor School Committee could entertain justified hope for a comprehensive national Catholic education organization.

Lord Howard of Glossop, T. W. Allies and the Duke of Norfolk used the money which the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee had raised to its best advantage; not only did the fund provide needed money to build and hire new schools, but it gave the Poor School Committee the power to enforce their demands for increased local efforts, accurate statistics, greater efficiency, and a comprehensive organization.

The Catholic bishops throughout England were spurred on to new energy by the situation which the Education Act created and the pressure which the national Catholic education officials exerted. In the autumn of 1870 and throughout 1871, they organized diocesan education crisis fund committees to correspond with the national Crisis Committee and

²⁰

Ibid., p. 851, (Clause 11).

diocesan education boards to complement the central Catholic Poor School Committee. During that period the bishops and their associates issued pastorals and organized meetings to urge the laity to support both the diocesan and national crisis funds. Again, they condemned the new unsectarian²¹ board schools and forbade any Catholic child to attend them. The co-operation and organization which the English Catholics rallied to meet the education crisis was superior to anything which they had displayed during the recent education contest in Parliament.

Money was collected and schools were built at a remarkable tempo. By June 1871, the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee had gathered over 47,000 pounds sterling. Since this money had to be matched by diocesan contributions and since some schools were built without the aid of Crisis Funds, it is a conservative estimate that, to provide new classrooms, Catholics themselves raised more than 100,000 pounds sterling in less than a year. These "Crisis funds" were distributed to help build 130 schools, to enlarge 34

21

For characteristic examples of pastorals and education meetings see "Pastoral of the Bishop of Hexham", Tablet, XXXVI (8, October, 1870), p. 469, "The Liverpool Education Meeting", ibid., XXXVI (29, October, 1870), p. 547, "Beverley - Pastoral of the Bishop", XXXVIII (9, December, 1871), p. 755.

existing schools and to rent sixteen temporary schools.

V

The Catholics met the problems, which the Elementary Education Act of 1870 presented them, with energy and determination. Catholics all over England united to fight for a common aim - Catholic education for Catholic children. Although the immediate cause for the education crisis was an external one created by the Education Act, the fight to save Catholic schools was an internal matter: the Catholics had to put their educational house in order, themselves. While they were extending and developing their own educational system, they needed no direct intercourse with the newly-formed school boards. The Education Act had allowed Catholic schools managerial independence from these school boards.

Even so a considerable controversy broke out among the Catholics concerning what relationship they should have with the new school boards. At first glance such a controversy appeared ridiculous: the Catholics were agreed that no

22

"Public Meeting of the Education Crisis Fund Committee - Supplement to the Tablet", *ibid.*, XXXVII (17, June, 1871), p. 1. In addition to their own financial exertions the Catholics were allowed government building grants for six months after the Education Act became law. Eighty-two Catholic schools applied for these. John Morley, *The Struggle For National Education* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1873), p. 17.

Catholic child should attend the unsectarian board schools and the Education Act seemed to have completely separated the denominational schools and the board schools. A closer examination of the Act indicated that Catholic education interests might be indirectly affected by the school boards' actions. The school boards might cause the Catholics to have to meet new outside problems. The controversial Clause twenty-five of the Education Act allowed the school board to give school tuition to extremely poor children; fees could even be given to needy students at denominational schools, such as the Catholic schools.²³ Since there were so many poor Catholic children, the school boards' decisions in this matter vitally concerned Catholic interests.

Also, Manning and others feared that the school boards might declare some of the Catholic schools inefficient and that the students in such schools would be forced to attend the unsectarian board schools.²⁴ And if any Catholic child did attend a board school, the school boards could determine the religious teaching or lack of it which he would receive. There was no question that the Catholic education effort would be affected by the school boards' decisions.

²³

See "Education Act", (Clause 25), in Appendix D.

²⁴

This discussion is based on H. E. Manning's letter to W. B. Ullathorne (September, 1870), in Dom Cuthbert Butler, The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, (London: Burns, Oates, Washbourne, 1926), Vol. II. pp. 146-147.

Nonetheless, the Roman Catholic officials were divided on the question of whether Catholics should sit on the school boards. Archbishop Manning maintained that since their education was affected by the school boards, the Catholics should maintain communication with those boards: if the Catholics got the opportunity, they should become members of the school board. If, on the other hand, the Catholics remained aloof the school boards might become hostile to their interests. Manning feared that such hostility might result in the boards declaring the lesser Catholic schools insufficient or inefficient. This would have caused half of the Catholic schools in London, for example, to be abandoned. Manning held that Catholics could, in conscience, sit on the school boards. If they found their consciences violated, they could simply withdraw from school board membership.²⁵

Bishop W. E. Ullathorne chose the opposite and more strictly conservative position: he mistrusted the Education Act and the new board schools and maintained that Catholics²⁶ could not, in conscience, sit on the school boards.

²⁵ H. E. Manning, *ibid.*, pp. 146-147. See also the other Manning letter to Ullathorne of September 17th, 1870, *ibid.*, p. 146.

²⁶ Dom Cuthbert Butler, *op. cit.*, Vol. 11, pp. 144 and 146.

The Catholic bishops' disagreement on whether or not Catholics could hold school board positions was not kept quiet. During and immediately after the period of school board elections in 1870, this controversy was publicly exposed by prominent prelates who wrote letters which were published in the Tablet. Ironically, Ullathorne's position was defended by Frederick Oakeley, a Canon in Manning's diocese of Westminster. Manning's position was argued by Canon Toole of Manchester who was Vicar-General of the Diocese of Salford.²⁷

The arguments which the correspondents put forth became a conflict between principle and expedience. Oakeley held the premise that Catholic school board members would violate the principles of their faith because they would have to co-operate in setting up Protestant schools. Such co-operation, Oakeley said, sanctioned the false theory which " ... leaves every man at liberty to choose his own religion". He maintained that the few practical results which Catholic intercourse with the school boards might achieve were overbalanced by the detrimental effect of such action; the Church's

27

See Canon Oakeley's letters to the Tablet, *ibid.*, XXXVI, (26, November, 1870), p. 681; (3, December, 1870), pp. 713-714; (17, December, 1870), p. 778; and *ibid.*, XXXVII (21, January, 1871), pp. 74-75; and Canon Toole's letters to the Tablet, *ibid.*, XXXVI (10, December, 1870), p. 745, and *ibid.*, XXXVII (28, January, 1871), p. 107. The following discussion of the school board controversy (below pp. 108-109), is based on these letters.

prohibition of Catholic attendance at board schools would become less persuasive. Canon Toole, who was himself a school board member, challenged Oakeley's contention that school board participation was a violation of Catholic principle. He said that Catholics could indeed help their own education effort by sitting on school boards and they would not be compromising their principles in so doing. The two relevant questions in the whole controversy were - would Catholics gain anything by sitting on the school boards and - would they violate Catholic principles in the attempt?

In the controversy, Oakeley argued for Catholic exclusiveness while Toole maintained that Catholics should enter into public questions which affected them. The former said that instead of Catholics entering hostile Protestant territory, they should direct their energy into purely Catholic pursuits. They should help build their own schools by supporting such associations as the Westminster Diocesan Education Fund, the Catholic Poor School Committee, and the Catholic Education Crisis Fund Committee. The latter argued that Catholics were too reluctant, already, to participate in the solution of those national issues in which they had a stake. They must take part or let the National Education League dictate national education policies.

VI

It was obvious that the Catholic Poor School Committee, of which Toole was a member, supported his stand in the school board controversy: Lord Howard of Glossop, the Poor School Committee president, himself, ran for a seat on the London School Board. Indeed, the Toole-Cakeley version of the Manning-Ullathorne disagreement was largely an academic one, for the first school board elections had already taken place when the controversy was most heated. The combined influence of the Catholic metropolitan of England and the Catholic Poor School Committee, no doubt, helped to produce considerable Catholic participation in the school board elections, if it did not quiet opposition to such participation.

As a minority group, the Catholics derived special advantage from the voting procedure which the Education Act prescribed for the election of school boards. The Act provided for the system of cumulative voting. Under this system, each voter was given one vote for each of the candidates to be elected and he could distribute his total votes among any candidate or candidates which he chose. ²⁸ Thus, in

²⁸

See "Education Act" (Clause 29), in Appendix D.

a district where there were five to be elected, one of whom was a Catholic, a Catholic voter could give all five votes to his co-religionist. Cumulative voting made it possible for the Catholics, as a minority group, to get at least some proportional representation on the school boards. This system gave them the advantage of concentrating all of their strength toward the election of Catholic candidates.

The Catholic campaign for the school board elections seemed to have made good use of this advantage. The Roman Catholics were advised to choose a modest number of candidates for the school boards. The number of candidates was to be in proportion to the expected number of Catholic votes, in order that the Catholic vote would not be spread too thinly. In districts where the Catholic population was too sparse, Catholics were urged to unite their votes with sympathizers of other denominations to secure the election of anti-League candidates.²⁹

Catholic candidates ran in all of the more densely-populated centres of England such as London, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds and Liverpool and in dozens of other English municipalities. Some of the candidates such as Lord Howard of Glossop, who contested a seat in London, and Very Rev. Canons Toole and O'Sullivan, who sought school-board positions in Manchester and Birmingham, were of the

most prominent Catholics available for such offices.³⁰ The Catholics showed considerable determination to influence the school boards.

The result of the school board elections in 1870 delivered both remarkable triumph and disappointment to the Catholic side. One of the more astonishing defeats at the polls was that of Lord Howard of Glossop, a candidate in the Westminster section of London. Lord Howard, whose supporters had conducted a rather vigorous campaign, was beaten,³¹ although by a small margin.

One of the more remarkable triumphs was enjoyed by a Catholic priest, Rev. W. H. Kenny, who ran for a seat at Dewsbury. Father Kenny received so many votes that he asked the Catholics who had not yet cast their ballots to choose the four Anglican candidates, in order to secure a denominational victory.³² In Wakefield, the Catholics estimated that 600 non-Catholics had voted for one of their priests,³³ who was seeking a school-board position.

³⁰ "The School Boards", Tablet, XXXVI (19, November, 1870), p. 640.

³¹ "The School Board Elections", Tablet, XXXVI (10, December, 1870), p. 754.

³² "School Boards", Tablet, XXXVII (21, January, 1871), p. 83

³³ "School Board Elections", Tablet, XXXVII (4, February, 1871), p. 146.

On the whole, the election results were encouraging to the Catholics who were represented on school boards in all the major centres of population except Newcastle. And in Liverpool four Catholics were elected to sit on the school board.³⁴ Cumulative voting, increased Catholic energy and decreased Protestant prejudice were factors in these successes. It was argued that because no Catholics formed a majority on a school board, their election could have had no practical results. Actually, on many of the school boards there was a balance of Dissenters who favoured the League and Anglicans who supported the Union. The existence of a single Catholic member could upset this balance in favour of denominational education. For example, in Bristol, seven members of the Church of England sat with seven Dissenters. The result of this arrangement on religious matters could have been dead-lock, but the presence of the Catholic member³⁵ gave the supporters of sectarian education a majority.

The most pressing need to the Catholics on the newly-formed school boards was to secure that payment of school fees to indigent Catholic children which Clause twenty-five of the Education Act allowed. In this and other

³⁴ Ibid., p. 146.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 146.

matters the Catholic and Anglican denominational school supporters had to face loud and distinguished opposition. For example, on the London School Board, John Morley and Professor Thomas Huxley used their influence to bitterly oppose this payment from the school rates on behalf of students attending denominational schools.³⁶ Conversely, the denominationalists were not without some prominent support: W. E. Forster addressed a nationally-published letter to the Liverpool School Board which reminded board members that poor children had a right to have their fees paid by the board so that they could attend the school of their parents' choice.³⁷

It would appear that at least the school boards in the more important cities of England such as London, Liverpool and Birmingham decided to make fees available to poor students attending denominational schools. Other centres such as Wednesbury, Ipswich and Sunderland refused to pay these fees.³⁸

³⁶ "The London School Board", Tablet, XXXVlll (4, November, 1871), p. 577.

³⁷ "Payment of Children's Fees", Tablet, XXXVll (6, May, 1871), p. 563.

³⁸ "The Tyranny of Unbelief", Tablet, XXXVlll (14, October, 1871), p. 485. and "School Boards and the Question of Fees", ibid., XXXVlll (21, December, 1871), p. 705. Although the Birmingham school board agreed to give fees to

The poverty of the Catholic body made such grants particularly beneficial to Catholic education. If only for this success, Manning and Toole's position that Catholics should sit on school boards was a fruitful one. In at least one case, the presence of Catholic members on an important school board made the difference between payment or non-payment of fees to poor students at denominational schools. The London Board's decision to make these payments was carried by only three votes. There were three Catholic members on that board. Without their presence, the issue might have resulted in deadlock.³⁹

VII

The Roman Catholic success in influencing school board decisions was looked upon with disfavour by the National Education League. The Catholics' co-operation with their Anglican colleagues on the school boards resulted in a stronger front for sectarian school interests. The League

poor students at denominational schools, the Birmingham town council refused to make funds available for that purpose. George Dixon, 23, April, 1872, Hansard, Vol.210, col. 1727.

³⁹ "The London School Board", Tablet, XXXVIII (4, November, 1871), p. 577.

members who were opposed to any extension of sectarian education resented this. Renewed League resentment posed another threat to Catholic interests.

Since Catholic participation on the school boards was made possible by the system of cumulative voting, the League tried to have that voting procedure repealed. In July, 1871, George Dixon, the League leader, proposed an Amendment Bill in the Commons to bring this about. He said that he wanted to eliminate cumulative voting because it did not effect fair representation on the school boards.⁴⁰ But it was clear from his approach that he really wanted to eliminate Catholic participation on these boards: he tried to make school board membership by the Catholics appear futile, by saying that they were always outnumbered by Protestant representatives.⁴¹

Dixon suggested that cumulative voting be replaced by a new method of school board election. Under his proposal, one-third of the school board members would resign every year. Then an annual election could be held to fill the school board vacancies. Since candidates for the vacant seats would be elected at large, there was no provision in

⁴⁰ 12, July, 1871, Hansard, Vol. 207, col. 1527.

⁴¹ 12, July, 1871, Hansard, Vol. 207, col. 1528.

Dixon's⁴² plan for proportional representation on the school boards.

The League chief's attempt to have the system of cumulative voting replaced was not successful. The House of Commons was not willing to follow Dixon's leadership in this matter. Not even all of the League members supported Dixon's Bill. One of them admitted that without proportional representation, such as was effected by cumulative voting, no Roman Catholic could have been elected to an English school board. And he implied that it would be unfair to silence the Catholic voice on the school boards.⁴³

The defeat of Dixon's proposal was more beneficial to the Roman Catholics than to any other religious body. It meant that Catholics could continue to participate on the school boards. And this participation was necessary: without it, they would not have been able to effectively urge the school boards to give school fees to indigent students at sectarian schools.

That was precisely what the League members wished, since they did not want to give any more public money to sectarian schools lest denominational education be extended. Their attempt to eliminate Catholic pressure on the school

⁴²

12, July, 1871, Hansard, Vol. 207, col. 1528.

⁴³

Morrison, 12, July, 1871, Hansard, Vol. 207, cols. 1533-1534.

boards had failed, but the League members did not give up their campaign against Clause 25. Their next manoeuvre was to try and have that Clause repealed in the House of Commons.

In April, 1872, George Dixon asked to be allowed to introduce a Bill into the Commons to repeal the twenty-fifth clause of the Education Act.⁴⁴ He argued that it was inconsistent with the spirit of the Education Act. According to Dixon, that Act had been based on the principle that the public paid only for secular education and to give fees to students at sectarian schools was, in effect, to pay for religious teaching.⁴⁵

Dixon's motion was badly defeated. The opinion which prevailed was that of W. E. Forster who said that if an indigent student who preferred sectarian education was not given financial help from the school board, he would not be able to attend the school of his choice. And to force that student into a board school would be unjust.⁴⁶ Most members of the House agreed with Forster. Dixon's motion was

⁴⁴ 23, April, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 210, col. 1714.

⁴⁵ 23, April, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 210, col. 1715.

⁴⁶ 23, April, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 210, col. 1730.

119
47

defeated by a majority of 201. This was a significant victory for the Roman Catholics. The Catholics successfully
48
overcame these threats from the League.

VIII

The Roman Catholic educators continued to maintain the defensive position in the two years which followed the Education Act of 1870. Their relationships with the government and with the National Education League were marked by attempts to save both what was left of the old denominational system of education and what they considered good in the new dual system. The Catholic campaign was still centred around the defense of religion in the schools.

This defense had not begun in 1869 and it did not end in 1872. Radical educationalists, like the League members, considered that the Education Act of 1870 had not gone far enough. In the decades which were to come the education reformers were to continue to press for further changes in the

47

23, April, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 210, col. 1744.

48

In addition to the threats by the League, the Catholics had to meet at least one potential threat from the government. The Education Code of 1871 did not allow enough time to teach religion in the schools. By visiting Mr. Forster, T.W. Allies and Lord Howard of Glossop helped persuade him to solve this problem. This information is

elementary education system. The Catholics were to continue to resist any of these changes which were harmful in any way to denominational education.

The English Catholics of 1872 knew what the future education issues would be. In March, 1872, George Dixon, the League leader, delineated his grievances with the Education Act of 1870 to the members of the House of Commons. He said that the Education Act was unsatisfactory because it did not provide for the general election of school boards; it did not achieve universal compulsory school attendance; it did not adequately eliminate school fees; it provoked religious discord throughout the country because it had not properly settled the religious question and it gave financial aid to denominational schools.⁴⁹ Then Henry Richard, in a long speech, repeated the radical Dissenters' demand for secular education.⁵⁰ These were the issues on which the radical educationalists would base their future demands. The Roman

contained in the following articles: "The New Education Code, 1871" and "Meeting of Catholic Poor School Committee", Tablet, XXXVII (4, 11, March, 1871), pp. 260 and 306; and in Allies' letter to the Tablet, ibid., XXXVII (18, March, 1871), p. 340.

⁴⁹

4, March, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 209, col. 1395.

⁵⁰

4, March, 1872, Hansard, Vol. 209, cols. 1407-1415, passim.

Catholics would meet these demands with a defense of the status quo whenever change might hurt Catholic education.

But the Catholic position in the years that followed the Education Act of 1870 would change emphasis somewhat. In 1885, the Catholics would add to their defense of the old a movement to change the education system in their favour. Led by Archbishop Manning, the Roman Catholics would seek greater financial aid for their schools⁵¹ and they were to meet some success in this attempt. Archbishop Manning would be asked to sit on a royal commission to study education problems. And his influence would result in better financial treatment for Catholic schools.⁵²

The "crisis" caused by the Education Act of 1870 was the major battle in the history of Catholic elementary education. The Catholic response to the challenge which that Act presented, protected and built upon their past accomplishments in elementary education. It also laid the groundwork for future accomplishments. The Elementary Education Act of

51

See H. E. Manning, "How Shall Catholics Vote at the Coming Parliamentary Election", Dublin Review, 3d series, XIV (October, 1885), pp. 408-411.

52

Manning was second in precedence only to the chairman on the Royal Commission on Elementary Education Acts - 1886-1887. The better financial treatment accorded to the denominational schools by the Education Act of 1891 was largely due to Manning's influence on that commission. "Manning, Henry Edward", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XII, p. 972.

1870 ushered in a new era for the education of all English children. The same Act resulted in more extensive Catholic elementary education. The 'iron age' of education which the Catholics had so feared never came to be.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

There was great need for educational reform in England in 1869. The existing denominational system of elementary education had failed to provide schooling for about half of the children of England.

Most English leaders knew that something had to be done to rectify this deficiency. But they disagreed on what should be done. English allegiance was usually divided between two education pressure groups. One, the Anglican-dominated National Education Union wanted to have the existing denominational system of education maintained and supplemented. The other, the Dissenter-supported National Education League, wanted to have the present system replaced by a new secularly-controlled one.

The Roman Catholics resisted the League attempt to initiate a new system of education. Their belief that dogmatic religious training was an essential part of education led them to support the existing system of elementary education. Under that system, the sectarian school managers were given complete freedom to teach their individual doctrines in their own classrooms.

Since this stand was essentially the same as that of the National Education Union, it was natural that the Catholics should co-operate with that Anglican-dominated pressure group: the Catholics, as a minority group, could not hope to form a third party as influential as the Union or the League. But the educational needs of the Catholics differed somewhat from those of the Anglicans. Their greater number of indigent students put the Catholic schools in more serious need of increased financial aid from the State. And their viewpoint was not exactly the same as the Anglicans'. Therefore, it was advisable for the Catholics to take independent steps to influence the education legislation.

The situation called for Catholics all over England to unite in a common voice. Ideally, there should have been a Catholic pressure group to correspond to the Union and the League. This would have been possible had the Catholic Poor School Committee been reorganized on a more comprehensive and national basis. The Poor School officials tried to achieve this needed re-organization: they urged that permanent diocesan education councils be formed to supplement and work with the central Committee. But their pleas went unanswered.

The failure to secure a truly national Catholic education society must be attributed in great part to the Catholic bishops and other diocesan administrators. The inauguration of diocesan boards of education was, logically, a move to be taken not by the executive of the Poor School

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Committee but by diocesan officials. The fact that, in most cases, these boards were not set up implicated the bishops and their associates in this failure.

The lack of a co-ordinated national Catholic education association meant that popular activity to influence the education legislation was localized. There were some major regional Catholic education meetings at London, Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool. But these important meetings were exceptions to a general inaction among rank and file Catholics.

Politically inexperienced, and without a co-ordinated organization, the English Catholics' efforts were not only localized they were sporadic. It could have been harmful to Catholic education if the executive of the Catholic Poor School Committee and interested prelates such as Archbishop Manning had not taken individual initiative to press the Catholic claims on the government. It might even have been disastrous to Catholic education if the National Education Union had not used its co-ordinated resources to press for the same end as the Catholics - the maintenance of the existing denominational system of education.

The Catholic alliance with the Union became even more important as the government's Education Bill moved toward the House of Commons. There was only one admitted English Catholic in the House of Commons and he died before the education legislation had been passed by the House. It was

essential that the views of those who wanted to maintain the old system of education be represented. And the supporters of the National Education Union who sat in the House performed this task. Without the National Education Union's participation in the Commons debates, the National Education League, whose leader, George Dixon, was himself a member of Parliament, might have exerted undue influence. This would have been fatal to Catholic interests.

As the time approached for the introduction of the government's Bill on elementary education, the lines of public opinion were clearly drawn. On the one side, the Roman Catholics and Anglicans who supported the principle of the National Education Union took the conservative stand: they held that the existing system of denominational elementary education should be maintained and supplemented. On the other side, the supporters of the National Education League, mostly moderate Dissenters and the radical Dissenters or Secularists who were outside the League took the liberal viewpoint: they maintained that the existing education system should be replaced by a more comprehensive secularly-controlled system.

The greatest barrier which separated the two sides was constructed of religious considerations. The Catholics and the Union were conservative because they wanted to keep religious instruction in the elementary schools as full and sectarian as it was under the old system. The League was

liberal because it wanted to soften that religious instruction into something which could be acceptable to all sects.

These views were diametrically opposed. The government could not have completely accepted the position of either group without alienating the other. In order to effect a system of elementary education which would be reasonably acceptable to both interests, the government had to arrive at a compromise. The Education Bill had to both preserve denominational education as the Catholics and Anglicans wanted and institute new secularly-controlled schools which children of any religion could attend, as the Dissenters wanted.

The compromise which W. E. Forster, the Vice-President of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, introduced in his Bill, was to initiate the dual system of elementary education. Under this system there were to be two kinds of schools. The old denominational schools were to continue as before under sectarian management and they were to have no important restrictions placed on their right to fully teach their own religious doctrines. But a new kind of school, which was to be operated by a combination of secular local and central control, was to be introduced. These new schools, called board schools, were intended to educate English children regardless of religious belief. This was to be made possible by a legally-enacted Conscience Clause which would allow objecting students to withdraw from the

schools at the time of religious instruction.

Forster's settlement of the religious question was incomplete. Although he had provided for the new board schools, he had not agreed to prohibit sectarian teaching in those schools. Instead, he had left it to the local school boards to decide what kind of religious lessons would be taught in their schools. Hence the most sectarian creeds could be taught in the new board schools. The Dissenters resented this; they wanted guarantees that a child of any religious persuasion could enter a board school without violating his conscience. They did not consider the Conscience Clause as sufficient protection.

The National Education League challenged Forster's tactic of passing on the religious question for the local school boards to solve. At the beginning of the debate over the second reading, its leader, George Dixon, introduced an amendment to force Parliament to decide what kind of religious teaching would be allowed in the new board schools. Dixon's amendment produced its intended effect: the sectarian quarreling which followed its introduction delayed the passage of the Bill. The government had to radically alter its Bill in order to expedite its passage through the House of commons.

Consequently, the Elementary Education Act differed greatly from the Bill which Forster had introduced. What

had started out as a Bill largely sympathetic to the demands of the National Education Union had become an Act which incorporated more of the League demands. Under the original terms of the Bill, religious teaching was to continue unrestricted in the old denominational schools. The Elementary Education Act, in its final form, stipulated that such religious teaching would have to be confined to before and after school hours. The government had intended to give the sectarian school managers a year to rectify their own deficiencies and prevent the building of board schools. But under the final terms of the Act, the sectarian school managers were to be given only six months to put their educational systems in order.

Forster's Bill, as it stood originally, would have allowed school boards to give financial support to the old denominational schools. And it would have allowed them complete freedom to have any religion taught in the new board schools. All of this was changed in the final Act. Now the school boards would not be able to give funds from the local rates to a school which taught any catechism peculiar to a particular denomination. Nor could the school boards cause any distinctive religious formulary to be taught in the new board schools.

But all of the gains were not on the side of the opponents of sectarian education. The supporters of sectarian education secured two substantial benefits: their

government maintenance grants were increased and the old denominational schools were allowed to continue, with no direct interference from the new school boards.

The increase in Privy Council grants to denominational schools was of special benefit to Roman Catholic schools. The original stipulation which would have allowed particular school boards to make funds available to denominational schools would probably have benefitted the Anglicans: because of their great numbers, Anglican school managers would, no doubt, have received adequate financial support from the school boards in urban areas and great support from school boards in rural areas. But the Catholics, because of their minority status, would have had no guarantee of any or consistent aid for their school from the local rates. When Gladstone proposed that voluntary schools should now have fifty percent of their maintenance costs paid by the government, the Catholics and others were assured of consistent support. Furthermore, the separation of Denominational and Board schools which Gladstone allowed, established the security of denominational teaching in Catholic schools, no matter what determination should be made regarding the religious teaching in the Board schools. This concession may be regarded as a concrete result of the overtures which Archbishop Manning, Lord Howard of Glossop, T. W. Allies and other Catholics had made to Gladstone and his government.

Although these two concessions were important, they did not change the fact that most of the gains during Commons debates on the legislation had been made by the opponents of sectarian education. The Roman Catholics had not been entirely pleased with the original Bill; they were less pleased by the final Act.

The Catholics' reaction to the dual system of elementary education which the Education Act created was somewhat unjust. The Act had allowed their schools to continue to operate with no seriously harmful restrictions. But the Catholics were not satisfied. They greatly disapproved of the establishment of new unsectarian schools. This was unfair because those Protestants who preferred unsectarian education had as much right as the Catholics to have the kind of schools they wanted.

The Catholic opposition to unsectarian education even caused one faction led by Bishop Ullathorne to argue that Catholics should take no part on the school boards lest they seem to approve of unsectarian education. This was in spite of the fact that Catholic education might be indirectly affected by the school boards' decision. Archbishop Manning's more practical view that Catholics could sit on school boards without compromising their principles fortunately prevailed. But Catholic participation on school boards was not intended as an admittance that Protestants should receive unsectarian education. The Catholic wish was

still to make all education sectarian.

Later developments proved this position to be too reactionary. Publicly-controlled unsectarian education became a necessity as the number of religious sects increased and as people took a more secular view of social services.

The Catholics had a more legitimate complaint regarding the financial aspects of the Education Act. The unsectarian board-schools were to be granted more public money than sectarian schools. Even though the Catholic schools received a fifty per cent increase in government maintenance grants, they still had to make up half of the money they needed through parental fees and voluntary donations. Furthermore, after six months they received no more building grants. The board schools, for their part, received two-thirds of the cost of maintenance and all of the building costs from public funds. This inequity of financial treatment was unjust. The Education Act had recognized the right of the Catholics to maintain sectarian education, but had put them at a financial disadvantage when they attempted to accomplish this right.

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 was the cornerstone on which the modern system of elementary schools in England was built. Hence, the future of Catholic elementary education in England depended on how well the English Catholics met the challenge which the Act presented them. Generally speaking, the Catholics met the challenge

remarkably well. The very fact that the Education Act presented the Catholics with problems spurred them on to new energy. At last they set up the co-ordinated national education society, the absence of which had so impaired their efforts to influence legislation; they collected great sums of money; and built and rented new schools. On the whole, the Education Act did not hurt Catholic elementary education. To the contrary, it pushed it to new heights.

Fifteen years after the Education Act was passed Catholic elementary education had made such progress that Catholic educators began to have important voices in public matters of education. Archbishop Manning's service on the royal commission to study elementary education problems attested to his prominence as a Catholic educator. By the 1880s the Catholic social position had improved so much that Archbishop Manning and his co-religionists could exert real influence on the legislators of English elementary education. The fact that the Education Act of 1891 incorporated Manning's suggestion of better financial treatment for Catholic schools was proof of this.

If only for this reason Manning's decision to co-operate with the dual system of education should be regarded as more productive than Bishop Ullathorne's stand. If, as Ullathorne had suggested, the Catholics had remained aloof

from non-Catholic education, the doors of communication might have been closed. Archbishop Manning might not have had the opportunity to successfully negotiate better financial treatment for Catholic schools. Perhaps part of the reason that the Education Act of 1870 had not provided better terms for Catholic schools was that the Catholics had been too reluctant to enter into public controversy. But the very hardships which the Education Act of 1870 had produced forced the Catholics into the political arena. They exerted considerable pressure to try to eliminate the inequities of the 1870 Act and they met with notable success. The Elementary Education Act helped to make the English Roman Catholics assume a degree of social responsibility which they had not realized before.

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION LEAGUE, BIRMINGHAM, 12, 13, OCTOBER, 1869.

[From "National Education League", The Times, 13,
October, 1869, p. 10.]

Object -

The establishment of a system which shall secure the education of every child in England and Wales.

Means -

1. Local authorities shall be compelled by law to see that sufficient school accommodation is provided for every child in their district.
2. The cost of founding and maintaining such schools as may be required shall be provided out of the local rates, supplemented by Government grants.
3. All schools aided by local rates shall be under the management of local authorities and subject to Government inspection.
4. All schools aided by local rates shall be unsectarian.
5. To all schools aided by local rates admission shall be free.
6. School accommodation being provided, the State or the local authorities shall have power to compel the attendance of children of suitable age not otherwise receiving education.

APPENDIX B

[Entries B, C and D have been edited for relevance to this thesis and to avoid repetitions and descriptions of minute detail.]

REPORT OF THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION LEAGUE, MANCHESTER, SEPTEMBER, 1869.

[From "Educational Memorandum - The National Education Union", Tablet, XXXIV (30, September, 1869), p. 704.]

Purpose: "Securing the primary education of every child by judiciously supplementing the present denominational system of education".

Statement: "A complete system of National Education, to harmonize with the existing framework, must embrace the following requirements:-

1. The primary instruction of all children, without exception, in reading, writing, and arithmetic.
2. The inculcation of religious and moral truth; whilst care be taken that Denominational teaching be not imposed upon children without the assent of the parents.
3. The cardinal principle of parental responsibility must be preserved; the parents to have the choice of schools, whether liable partially or wholly for the cost of schooling.
4. When the parents are unable to pay for the children's schooling, and come under the class of paupers, indoor or outdoor, then the cost of instruction to come out of the poor rates. Vagrant children in boroughs, found wandering about the streets, to be liable to be sent by the police to industrial schools; the schools to be maintained by the borough rate.
5. The education of children of the working classes should combine industrial training with attendance at school, as under the provisions of the half-time system; that is

half-time attendance at school, and half-time at work.

6. No child or young person to be allowed to work full time without having passed a satisfactory examination in reading writing and arithmetic; and having received a certificate of these qualifications, such certificate to be a passport to full time. The period of half-time to be prolonged beyond the present age of thirteen until such child or young person shall have satisfactorily passed such examination. Discretion allowed to examiners to pass those naturally incapable.

7. All schoolmasters in schools aided by Government to be properly qualified for their work; and their qualification to be tested by a certificate of efficiency to be granted by competent examiners.

8. In Denominational schools receiving Government aid, a Conscience Clause to be insisted upon, to prevent Denominational teaching of children whose parents object thereto.

9. Special grants for technical or scientific instruction should form an essential feature in all schools aided by Government.

...Conclusion

. ... There is no necessity to burden the rates with the cost of educating children whose parents are able, and in most cases willing, to bear that cost themselves.

. ... Rates in education should only be applied when other means fail, as in the instances of children of paupers and vagrants.

. ... What is wanted is to supplement, not supersede, the existing means of education.

. ... The object of the proposed National Education Union is to include educators and teachers of every denomination, and to organize the present agencies of instruction in one comprehensive and National scheme which the Government is pledged to promote during the next session of Parliament.

APPENDIX C

[The clauses in this Bill which were significantly amended in the final Act are indicated by this symbol : x The references which precede the symbol are to the amended version of the Clauses as found in the "Education Act". The Clauses in this Bill which were deleted from the final Act are indicated by this symbol: xx All other Clauses were substantially the same and are not repeated in Appendix D -("Education Act").]

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES

[From British Sessional Papers - House of Commons,
33, Victoria, Vol. 1, pp. 505-539.]

PRELIMINARY

"This Act may be cited as "The Elementary Education Act 1870".

SUPPLY OF SCHOOLS

School district to have sufficient public schools

5. There shall be provided for every school district a sufficient amount of accommodation in public elementary schools (as hereinafter defined) available for all the children resident in such district for whose elementary education suitable provision is not otherwise made, and where there is an insufficient amount of such accommodation, in this Act referred to as "public school accommodation", the deficiency shall be supplied in manner provided by this Act.

Supply of schools in case of deficiency

6. Where the Education Department, in the manner provided by this Act are satisfied and have given public notice that there is an insufficient amount of public school accommodation for any school district, and the deficiency is not supplied within the time limited for the purpose, a school board shall be formed for such district and shall supply such deficiency, and in case of default by the school board the Education Department shall cause the duty of such board to be performed in manner provided by this Act.

REGULATIONS FOR CONDUCT OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

[See also Clause 7, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

7* Every public elementary school within the meaning of this Act shall be subject to the following regulations;namely,

(1) The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of her Majesty's inspectors, so, however, that no such inspector, except with the permission of the Education Department, and on the request of the managers of the school, shall inquire into the religious instruction given at such school, or examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book:

(2) The school shall be conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual Parliamentary grant:

(3) No scholar shall be required, as a condition of being admitted into or of attending or of enjoying all the benefits of the school, to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school, or any place of religious worship, or to learn any such catechism or religious formulary, or to be present at any such lesson or instruction or observance as may have been objected to on religious grounds by the parent of the scholar sending his objection in writing to the managers or principal teacher of the school, or one of them.

PROCEEDING FOR SUPPLY OF SCHOOLSDetermination by Education Department of deficiencies of public school accommodation.

8. For the purpose of determining with respect to every school district the amount of public school accommodation, if any, required for such district, the Education Department shall, immediately after the passing of this Act, cause such returns to be made as in this Act mentioned, and on receiving these returns, and after such inquiry, if any, as they think necessary, shall consider whether any and what public school accommodation is required for such district, and in so doing they shall take into consideration every elementary school whether public or not, which in their opinion gives efficient elementary education and is suitable for the children of such district.

Notice By Education Department of public school
accommodation required.

9. If the Education Department consider that the amount of public school accommodation for any school district is insufficient, they shall publish a notice setting forth with respect to such district the description thereof, number, size and description of the elementary schools (if any) available for such district, which the Education Department have taken into consideration as above mentioned, and the amount and description the public school accommodation which appears to them to be required for the district, and any other particulars which the Education Department think expedient.

If any persons being either -

(1) Ratepayers of the district, not less than ten, or if less than ten being rated to the poor rate upon a rateable value of not less than one-third of the whole rateable value of the district, or,

(2) The managers of any elementary school in the district, feel aggrieved by the declaration of such deficiency, such persons may, within one month after the publication of the notice, apply in writing to the Education Department for and the Education Department shall direct the holding of a public inquiry in manner provided by this Act.

Formation of school board and requisition to provide
schools.

[See also Clause 10, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

10. If after the expiration of such period the Education Department are satisfied that all public school accommodation required by the final notice to be supplied, has not been so supplied, the Education Department may cause a school board to be formed for the district as provided in this Act, and may send a requisition to the school board so formed requiring them to take proceedings for supplying the public school accommodation mentioned in the requisition.

MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOLS BY SCHOOL BOARD

Management of school by school board.

[See also Clause 14, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

14. Every school provided by a school board shall be a public elementary school, and shall be conducted as such under the control and management of such board.

Appointment of managers by school board.

15. The school board may, if they think fit, from time to time delegate the control and management of any school provided by them, with or without any restrictions, to a body of managers appointed by them, consisting of not less than three persons.

Any manager appointed under this section may resign on giving written notice to the board. The rules contained in the third schedule to this Act respecting the proceedings of bodies of managers appointed by a school board shall be observed.

Fees of children

17. Every child attending a school provided by any school board shall pay such weekly fee as may be prescribed by the school board, with the consent of the Education Department, but the school board may remit the whole or part of such fee in the case of any child when they are of the opinion that the parent of such child is unable from poverty to pay the same, but such remission shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent.

Managers may transfer school to school board

21. The managers of any elementary school in the district of any school board, with the assent of such number of this body, if any, as their constitution as binding them, or, if there is no such number, of a majority of those members who are present at meeting of their body duly constituted, may, with the consent of the Education Department, make an arrangement with the school board for transferring their school to such board, and the school board may assent to such arrangement. ...

Every school so transferred shall be deemed to be a school provided by the school board.

MISCELLANEOUS POWERS OF SCHOOL BOARDAssistance by school board to existing schools

22xx A school board may, in their discretion, grant pecuniary assistance, of such amount and for such purposes as they think fit, to such public elementary schools in their district not provided with them as are willing to receive it, provided that such assistance is granted on equal terms to all such schools upon conditions to be approved by the Education Department.

Discontinuance of assistance after notice

23xx A school board, upon publishing notice to that effect, may, at the expiration of twelve months from such notice, discontinue the grant of pecuniary assistance to public elementary schools in their district.

Payment of school fees

[See also Clause 25, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

24xx The school board may, if they think fit, pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable at any public elementary school by any child resident in their district whose parent is in their opinion unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent; and such payment shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent.

Election of school board

[See also Clauses 29, 31, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

30xx With respect to the election under this Act of a school board, the following provisions shall have effect:

(1) The number of members of a school board shall be three, or a multiple of three not exceeding twelve according as may be determined in the first instance by a resolution of the body which elects such boards and afterwards from time to time by a resolution of school board, approved by the Education Department. ...

EXPENSESSchool Fund of school board

46. The expenses of the school board under this Act shall be paid out of a fund called the school fund. There shall be carried to the school fund all moneys received as fees from scholars, or out of moneys provided by Parliament, or raised by way of loan, or in any manner whatever received by the school board in this capacity of a school board under this Act, and any deficiency shall be raised by the school board as provided by this Act.

Deficiency of school fund raised out of rates

47. Any sum required to meet any deficiency in the school fund, whether for satisfying past or future liabilities, shall be paid by the rating authority out of the local rate.

Expense of Providing a school may be spread over thirty years

[See also Clause 57, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

50x Where a school board incur any expense in providing or enlarging a schoolhouse, they may, with the consent of the Education Department, spread the payment over several years, not exceeding thirty, and may for that purpose borrow money on the security of the school fund, and may charge that fund and the local rate with the payment of the principal and interest due in respect of the loan. ...

ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOLAttendance of child at school

[See also Clause 74, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

66x Every school board exercising powers under this Act may from time to time, with the approval of the Education Department, make byelaws for all or any of the following purposes:

(1) Requiring the parents of children above the age of five years and under the age of twelve years to cause

such children (unless there is a reasonable excuse) to attend school:

(2) Determining the time during which children are so to attend school, provided that no such byelaw shall be contrary to anything contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour.

(3) Providing for the remission of the whole or any part of the fees of any child where the parent satisfies the school board that he is unable from poverty to pay the same.

(4) Imposing penalties for the breach of any byelaws.

(5) Revoking or altering any byelaw previously made.

Any of the following reasons shall be a reasonable excuse, namely,

(1) That the child is under efficient instruction in some other manner.

(2) That the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness or any unavoidable cause.

(3) That there is no public elementary school open which the child can attend within one mile, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child. ...

(11.)

PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS

Parliamentary grants to public schools only

[See also Clause 96, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

82x After the thirty-first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, no grant out of moneys provided by Parliament shall be made to any school which is not a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act.

Conditions of annual parliamentary grant

[See also Clause 97, "Education Act", Appendix D.]

83x The conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant shall be those contained in the minutes of the

Education Department in force for the time being, but such conditions shall not require that the school shall be in connexion with a religious denomination, or that religious instruction shall be given in the school.

Conditions of future building grant

86mm After the passing of this Act no parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up any elementary school, unless, in addition to the other conditions (if any) prescribed by the Education Department, the instrument declaring the trust of such school provides to the satisfaction of the Education Department for the school being always conducted as a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act.

APPENDIX D

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES (9th, August, 1870)

[From The Public General Statutes Passed in the
Thirty-Third and Thirty-Fourth Years of
the Reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria,
1870 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode,
Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent
Majesty, 1870), c. 75, pp. 443-483.]

REGULATIONS FOR CONDUCT OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

7. Every elementary school which is conducted in accordance with the following regulations shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of the Act; and every public elementary school shall be conducted in accordance with the following regulations (a copy of which regulations shall be conspicuously put in every such school); namely,

(1) It shall not be required, as a condition of any child being admitted into or continuing in the school, that he shall attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school, or any place of religious worship, or that he shall attend any religious observance or any instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere, from which observance or instruction he may be withdrawn by his parent, or that he shall, if withdrawn by his parent, attend the school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs:

(2) The time or times during which any religious observance is practised or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school shall be either at the beginning or at the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every school-room; and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parent from such observance or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school:

(3) The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's inspectors, so, however, that it shall be no part of the duties of such inspector to inquire into any instruction in religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book:

(4) The school shall be conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant. ...

Formation of school board and requisition to provide schools

10. If after the expiration of a time, not exceeding six months, to be limited by the final notice, the Education Department are satisfied that all the public school accommodation required by the final notice to be supplied has not been so supplied, nor is in the course of being supplied with due dispatch, the Education Department shall cause a school board to be formed for the district as provided in this Act, and shall send a requisition to the school board so formed requiring them to take proceedings forthwith for supplying the public school accommodation mentioned in the requisition, and the school board shall supply the same accordingly.

MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOLS BY SCHOOL BOARD

Management of school by school board

14. Every school provided by a school board shall be conducted under the control and management of such board in accordance with the following regulations:

(1) The school shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act:

(2) No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school.

MISCELLANEOUS POWERS OF SCHOOL BOARDPayment of school fees

25. The school board may, if they think fit, from time to time, for a renewable period not exceeding six months, pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable at any public elementary school by any child resident in their district whose parent is in their opinion unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent; and such payment shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent.

Establishment of free schools in special cases

26. If a school board satisfy the Education Department that, on the ground of the poverty of the inhabitants of any place in their district, it is expedient for the interests of education to provide a school at which no fees shall be required from the scholars, the boards may, subject to such rules and conditions as the Education Department may describe, provide such school and may admit scholars to such school without requiring any fee. ...

CONSTITUTION OF SCHOOL BOARDSSchool Board

29. The school board shall be elected in manner provided by this Act, - in a borough by the persons whose names are on the burgess roll of such borough for the time being in force, and in a parish not situate in the metropolis by the ratepayers.

At every such election every voter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of the members of the school board to be elected, and may give all such votes to one candidate, or may distribute them among the candidates, as he thinks fit.

The school board in the metropolis shall be elected in the manner hereinafter provided by this Act. ...

Election of School Board

31. With respect to the election under this Act of a school board, except in the metropolis, the following provisions shall have effect:

(1) The number of members of a school board shall be such number, not less than five nor more than fifteen, as may be determined in the first instance by the Education Department, and afterwards from time to time by a resolution of the school board approved by the Education Department.

Borrowing by school board

57. Where a school board incur any expense in providing or enlarging a school house, they may, with the consent of the Education Department, spread the payment over several years, not exceeding fifty, and may for that purpose borrow money on the security of the school fund and local rate, and may charge that fund and the local rate with the payment of the principle and interest due in respect of the loan. They may, if they so agree with the mortgage, pay the amount borrowed, with the interest, by equal annual instalments, not exceeding fifty, and if they do not so agree, they shall annually set aside one fiftieth of the sum borrowed as a sinking fund.

ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL

As to attendance of children at school

74. Every school board may from time to time, with the approval of the Education Department, make byelaws for all or any of the following purposes:

(1) Requiring the parents of children of such age, not less than five years nor more than thirteen years, as may be fixed by the byelaws, to cause such children (unless there is some reasonable excuse) to attend school:

(2) Determining the time during which children are so to attend school; provided that no such byelaw shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects, or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs, or shall be contrary to anything contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour:

(3) Providing for the remission or payment of the whole or any part of the fees of any child where the parent satisfies the school board that he is unable from poverty to pay the same:

(4) Imposing the penalties for the breach of any byelaws:

(5) Revoking or altering any byelaw previously made.

Provided that any byelaw under this section requiring a child between ten and thirteen years of age to attend school shall provide for the total or partial exemption of such child from the obligation to attend school if one of Her Majesty's inspectors certifies that such child has reached a standard of education specified in such byelaw.

Any of the following reasons shall be reasonable excuse; namely,

(1) That the child is under efficient instruction in some other manner:

(2) That the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness or any unavoidable cause:

(3) That there is no public elementary school open which the child can attend within such distance, not exceeding three miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child, as the byelaws may prescribe. ...

(11)

PARLIAMENTARY GRANTSParliamentary grants to public elementary schools only

96. After the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, no parliamentary grant shall be made to any elementary school which is not a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act.

No parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up any elementary school, except in pursuance of a memorial duly signed, and containing the information required by the Education Department for enabling them to decide on the application, and sent to the Education Department on or before the thirty-first day of December one thousand eight hundred and seventy.

Conditions of annual parliamentary grant

97. The conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant shall be those contained in the minutes of the Education Department in force for the time being, and shall amongst other matters provide that after the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one -

(1) Such grants shall not be made in respect of any instruction in religious subjects:

(2) Such grant shall not for any year exceed the income of the school for that year which was derived from voluntary contributions, and from school fees, and from any sources other than the parliamentary grant; but such conditions shall not require that the school shall be in connexion with a religious denomination, or that religious instruction shall be given in the school, and shall not give any preference or advantage to any school on the ground that it is or is not provided by a school board. ...

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. PRIMARY PRINTED SOURCES

1. Parliamentary Debates and Papers

"An Act To Provide For Public Elementary Education In England and Wales", The Public General Statutes Passed in the Thirty-Third and Thirty-Fourth Years of the Reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, 1870. Vol. V of The Law Reports. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, C.75, pp. 443-483.

"A Bill To Provide For Public Elementary Education in England and Wales", British Sessional Papers - House of Commons, 33. Victoria. Vol. I, pp. 505-539.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d series. London: Cornelius Buck, 1869-1872, Vols. 199-213 (1869-1872).

2. Education Meeting Reports, Letters and Miscellaneous Sources

"Article by T. W. Allies", Month, XLII (November, 1870), 609-612.

"Education Meeting Reports", in Tablet (a weekly newspaper), XXXIII - XL (January, 1869 - December, 1872). Vol. XXXV includes January - June, 1870; vol. XXXVI includes July-December, 1870, and so on. There were two exceptions: vol. XXXIII includes January - May, 1869 and vol. XXXIV includes June - December, 1869.

"Education Society Report", in Dublin Review, new series, XIX (July, 1872), 78-189.

"Education Society Reports", in Tablet, XXXIII - XL (January, 1867 - December, 1872).

"Education Society Report" in The Times, 13, October, 1869, p. 10.

"Letter to the Editor", in Dublin Review, new series, XLV (April, 1870). 434-437 n.

"Letters to the Editor", Tablet, XXXIII-XL (January, 1869-December, 1872).

Manning, Henry Edward. National Education. London: Burns and Oates, 1889. This is a collection of his periodical articles and a pamphlet.

"Roman Catholic Bishops' Pastorals", Tablet, XXXIII-XL (January, 1869 - December, 1872).

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Articles From Dictionary and Encyclopedias

"Allies, Thomas William", Dictionary of National Biography, Twentieth Century, Sidney Lee ed. London: Oxford University Press, Vol. 1, pp. 37-38.

"England", in Paul Monroe ed., Cyclopedia of Education, 5 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1928, Vol. 1, pp. 459-482.

"Forster, William Edward", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. VI, pp. 455-471.

"Montagu, Lord Robert", Dictionary of National Biography, Twentieth Century, Vol. 11, pp. 638-640.

"Oakeley, Frederick", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XIV, pp. 731-732.

"Richard, Henry", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XVI, pp. 1094-1096.

"Ullathorne, William Bernard", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XX, pp. 19-21.

Ward, Bernard. "Oakeley, Frederick", Catholic Encyclopedia. Charles G. Herbermann et. al., eds. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911, Vol. XI, p. 173.

-----"Ullathorne, William Bernard", Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XV, pp. 121-122.

"Winterbotham, Henry Self Page", Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XXI, pp. 1921-1922.

2. Biographies, General Histories and Monographs.

- Adamson, J. W. English Education, 1789-1902. Cambridge: University Press, 1930.
- Arnold, Matthew. Reports on Elementary Schools 1852-1882. London: Macmillan, 1889.
- Barnard, H. C. A Short History of English Education, 1760-1944. London: University Press, 1947.
- Barnes, A. S. The Catholic Schools of England. London: Williams and Norgate, 1926.
- Beales, A. C. F. "The Struggle For the Schools", in George Beck, ed. The English Catholics, 1850-1950. London: Burns, Oates, 1950.
- Birchenough, Charles. History of Elementary Education in England and Wales. London: University Tutorial Press, 1930.
- Burke, Thomas. Catholic History of Liverpool. Liverpool: C. Tinling and Co., 1910.
- Butler, Dom Cuthbert. The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne 2 vols. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1926.
- Craik, Sir H. The State in its Relation to Education. London: Macmillan, 1884.
- Curtis, S. J. History of Education in Great Britain. London: University Tutorial Press, 1948.
- Dark, Sidney, Manning. London: Duckworth, 1936.
- Dent, H. C. Change in English Education. London: University of London Press, 1952.
- Evennett, H. O. The Catholic Schools of England and Wales. Cambridge: University Press, 1944.
- Greenough, J. C. The Evolution of the Elementary Schools of Great Britain. New York: Appleton, 1903.
- Gwynn, Dennis. "The Irish Immigration" in George Beck, ed. The English Catholics, 1850-1950. London: Burns Oates, 1950.

- Holland, H. W. (Rev.) Proposed National Arrangements For Primary Education. London: Longmans, 1870.
- Holman, Henry. English National Education. London: Blackie and Son, 1890.
- Howard, Christopher. "Manning and Education", in John Fitzsimmons ed. Manning: Anglican and Catholic. London: Burns Oates, 1951.
- Hughes, Philip. "The Bishops of the Century", and "The Coming Century", in George Beck ed. The English Catholics, 1850-1950. London: Burns Oates, 1950.
- Hutton, Arthur W. Cardinal Manning. London: Methuen, 1894.
- Lemire, H. M. Le Cardinal Manning et Son Action Social. 2nd ed. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1894.
- Leslie, Shane. Henry Edward Manning: His Life and Labours. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1921.
- Maltby, S. E. Manchester and the Movement For National Elementary Education, 1800-1870. Manchester: University Press, 1918.
- Monpenny, W. F. and G. E. Buckle. The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Vol. II, 1860-1881. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Morley, John. The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. 3 vols. New York and London: Macmillan, 1903.
- . The Struggle For National Education. London: Chapman and Hall, 1893.
- Oakeley, Frederick Canon, "Relations With the Young", Lecture V (1870), in his The Priest on the Mission. Troy New York: P. J. Deoley, 1871, pp. 82-93.
- Purcell, E. S. Manning As a Catholic. Vol. II of his Life of Cardinal Manning. London: Macmillan, 1896.
- Reid, Sir Wemyss. Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster. London: Chapman and Hall, 1889.

- Sadler, M. E. and J. W. Edwards. "Public Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1870-1895", in their Education Department Special Reports on Educational Subjects. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1897, Vol. 1, pp. 1-71.
- Scott-James, R. A. ed. Education in Britain. Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. London: Frederick Muller, 1944.
- Smith, Frank. A History of English Elementary Education, 1760-1902. London: University Press, 1931.
- Snead-Cox, J. G. Life of Cardinal Vaughn. 2 Vols. London: Herbert and Daniel, 1911.
- Sweeney, Morgan. "Diocesan Organisation and Administration", in George Beck, ed. The English Catholics, 1850-1950. London: Burns Oates, 1950.
- Thomson, David. England in the Nineteenth Century. Harmondsworth Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1953.
- Thureau-Dangin, Paul. De La Mort de Wiseman à La Mort de Manning, 1865-1892. Troisième Partie de La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX Siècle. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1906.
- Trevelyan, G. M. British History in the Nineteenth Century, 1782-1901. London: Longmans, Green, 1931.
- Woodward, E. L. "Education, 1815-1870", in his The Age of Reform, 1815-1870. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

3. Articles in Newspapers and Periodicals

- Dublin Review, (a quarterly), new series, XIV-XIX (January, 1869-July, 1872). All articles on education in these issues have been consulted. Vol. XIV includes January and April, 1870; vol. XV includes July and October, 1870, and so on.

Month, X-XVII, (January, 1869 - November-December, 1872).

All articles on education in these issues have been consulted. Six months' issues comprise one volume. Before January, 1871, a separate issue was released each month. Beginning with January, 1871, each issue combined two months: January-February, 1871; March-April, 1871, and so on.

"The New School Boards", Quarterly Review, CXXXI (July, 1871), 263-300.

"The Roman Catholics and National Education", The Times, (17, November, 1869), p. 4.

Tablet, XXXIII-XL (January, 1869-December, 1872). All articles on education in these issues have been consulted.

VITA AUCTORIS

Family Gerald Wayne Olsen; born 16, September, 1939, first of four children of Gerald Edmund Olsen and Juliet Josephine Olsen (née Reaume).

Education

1945-1950 Attended Immaculate Conception School, Windsor, Ontario (conducted by Grey Sisters).

1950-1952 Student at De La Salle School, Windsor, Ontario (Christian Brothers).

1952-1954 Studied at St. Joseph's Junior High School, Windsor, Ontario (Sisters of St. Joseph).

1954-1957 Pupil at Corpus Christi High School, Windsor, Ontario (Ursuline Sisters).

1957-1961 Undergraduate in Honours English and History at Assumption University of Windsor.

1961-1962 Candidate for Master's degree in History at Assumption University.

Other Activities

1958-1959 Summer clerk at Pajot Insurance, LaSalle, Ontario.

1960 Summer assistant at Carnegie Library, Windsor, Ontario.

1961 Summer office worker at Ford of Canada, Windsor, Ontario.

Award and Scholarships

1957-1961 Ford of Canada Scholarship.

1959 "Outstanding Student in the Humanities" Award.

1961 Assumption University History Department Master's Fellowship.

1962 University of Western Ontario History Department Doctoral Fellowship.